Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-031
Thursday
16 February 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-031 *16 February 1989*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

U.S. Delays Decision on Land-Based Missiles *[TASS]* 1
FRG Deferral of Missile Project Considered *[IZVESTIYA 10 Feb]* 1
*Armed Forces Official on 'Parity' in Europe *[TRUD 10 Feb]* 2

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

New Pact Commander in Chief Lushev Interviewed *[TASS]* 4
Warsaw Pact Defense Ministers Meet in Moscow *[TASS]* 4
Defense Experts Meet in Bucharest 14-15 Feb *[TASS]* 4
Pact Foreign Ministry Delegates Meet in Warsaw *[TASS]* 4
CEMA Trade Ministers Meeting Opens in Havana *[TASS]* 5
CEMA Standardization Session Held in Moscow *[IZVESTIYA 10 Feb]* 5

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Perfilyev Gives Foreign Ministry Briefing 6
Kabul 'Relatively Calm' *[Moscow Radio]* 6
Last Soviet Soldier Leaves *[TASS]* 6
Gorbachev Thanks UN for Armenian Quake Aid *[TASS]* 7
UN's Cordovez Supports Withdrawal From Afghanistan *[Chernyshev on TASS]* 7
EEC Integration, 'Common European Home' Viewed *[Kolesnichenko in PRAVDA 13 Feb]* 7
*Domestic, U.S., PRC 'Closed' Areas Examined *[IZVESTIYA 10 Feb]* 8

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bush Discusses Relations With Soviet Union 11
Carrying Out Policy Review *[PRAVDA 16 Feb]* 11
Bush Seen as 'Extremely Cautious' *[Moscow Radio]* 11
Baker's Foreign Diplomatic Tour Reported 11
UK Suggests Easing Cocom Curbs *[IZVESTIYA 15 Feb]* 11
'Lightning Visit' to Greece *[IZVESTIYA 16 Feb]* 12
Redman Says Aid to Afghan Rebels Will Continue *[TASS]* 12

China

Marchuk, Delegation Sign Document, End Visit *[TASS]* 12
Nakhodka Party Chief on Far East Economic Zone *[Moscow International]* 13

Northeast Asia

75 Percent of Soviet Troops To Leave Mongolia *[Ulaanbaatar International]* 13
DPRK, ROK Agree on Joint Projects in USSR *[TASS]* 14
Panmunjon Inter-Korean Talks Viewed *[PRAVDA 12 Feb]* 14
DPRK General Comments on Dialogue With South *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Feb]* 15
North-South Dialogue Put to 'Serious Test' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Feb]* 15
Speech by Japan's Takeshita Views Soviet Ties *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Feb]* 16

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Observers Preview Jakarta Meeting on Cambodia 16
Opposition Demands Viewed *[Afonin on TASS]* 16
PRC Stance 'Constructive' *[Fedorov on Moscow International]* 17
Thai Talks With Hun Sen Termed 'Courageous' *[Alekseyev on Moscow International]* 17
Thai Businessmen Urge Ties With Indochina *[PRAVDA 14 Feb]* 18
Philippines' Laurel Calls for Bases Closure *[TASS]* 18
Philippines Senator Warns of Honasan Plans *[TASS]* 18
Commentary Views Marcos Request for Return *[Aleksandrov on Moscow International]* 19
Radio Acknowledges Listener's Letter *[Moscow International]* 19

Near East & South Asia

Shevardnadze Outlines Goals of Mideast Trip *[PRAVDA 16 Feb]* 19
Afghan Government Statement Warns Pakistan *[TASS]* 20
Party-Government Appeal to Returning Veterans *[PRAVDA 16 Feb]* 21
Gromov Speaks After Completion of Afghan Pullout 22
Thanks CPSU, Government *[Moscow Radio]* 22
Mourns Fallen Soviet Soldiers *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Feb]* 22
Comments to Moscow TV *[Moscow TV]* 23
Soldiers Shown Returning From Afghanistan 24
Pullout Called Sign of 'Realism' *[Moscow TV]* 24
Welcomed by Public in Kushka *[Moscow TV]* 24
UN Observers Confirm Completion of Pullout *[TASS]* 24
UN, FRG Praise Soviet Afghanistan Withdrawal *[TASS]* 25
'Calm Situation' Reported in Kabul *[IZVESTIYA 16 Feb]* 25
Mujahidin Continue Efforts To Form Government 26
'Acute Differences' Remain *[TASS]* 26
'Stalemate' in Talks *[TASS]* 27
Pakistan Escalating Moves Against Afghan Regime *[IZVESTIYA 15 Feb]* 27
Kornilov Criticizes U.S. Aid to Afghan Rebels *[Kornilov on TASS]* 28
Appeal to U.S., Pakistan for Return of POW's *[TASS]* 29
Bovin Views Lessons of Afghanistan War *[Sofia TRUD 15 Feb]* 29
Ties With Israel Require Settlement in Mideast *[Moscow International]* 30
Iran Said Undergoing 'Serious Changes' *[IZVESTIYA 16 Feb]* 30

Sub-Saharan Africa

RSA 'Sortie' Threatens Tripartite Agreement *[PRAVDA 14 Feb]* 31
Scientist on 'Arrest' of Soviet Ship *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Feb]* 31
Senegal Party Delegation Visits Moscow *[PRAVDA 12 Feb]* 32
Professor Comments on African Socialism *[Moscow International]* 32

East Europe

Poland's Urban Comments on Roundtable Process *[Moscow TV]* 33
Paper Portrays Walesa, Solidarity Revival *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Feb]* 34
Delegation Studies PZPR Role in Agriculture *[PRAVDA 12 Feb]* 37
GDR Prices Debate Seen Relevant to USSR *[PRAVDA 13 Feb]* 37

West Europe

FRG's Genscher Favors Continuing Disarmament *[TASS]* 38
Italy's De Mita Supports Expanding Relations *[IZVESTIYA 12 Feb]* 38
Voronin Delegation Meets French Businessmen *[TASS]* 39
UK Amendments Needed for War Crimes Trials 40
Finnish Diplomats Briefed on Estonian Reforms *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 4 Feb]* 40

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

More on Industrial Workers' Moscow Meeting 42
Gorbachev's Opening Speech *[PRAVDA 16 Feb]* 42
Gorbachev Closing Speech *[PRAVDA 16 Feb]* 43
Working Group Meets on Union-Republic Powers *[PRAVDA 16 Feb]* 47
Gorbachev, Medvedev Attend Soiree for Artist *[Moscow TV]* 48
More on People's Deputies Election Campaign 48
PRAVDA Editorial *[15 Feb]* 48
*Lithuanian Nomination Process *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 11 Feb]* 50
Ukraine's Draft Restructuring Program Reviewed *[RADYANSKA UKRAINA 7 Feb]* 51
Armenian Power Unit Calls for Lowered Consumption *[Yerevan Radio]* 54
Yerevan Commandant Reports Violations, Arrests *[Yerevan Radio]* 54
Baku Commandant Reports Violations, Arrests *[Baku Radio]* 54
Lithuanian Scholars Consider National Day *[Vilnius International]* 54
* Lithuania's Brazauskas on Improvement of Society *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 31 Dec]* 56
Latvian Journalists Demand Independent Union *[Riga International]* 60
'Migrant' Serviceman in Latvia on People's Front *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Feb]* 61
Estonia Registers People's Front Charter *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 4 Feb]* 63
Estonian Labor Collective Council Meets *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 1 Feb]* 64
Estonian Cultural Council Urges Citizenship Laws *[SIRP JA VASAR 3 Feb]* 65
Estonian Komsomol Elects Newspaper Editor *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 4 Feb]* 65
Afanasyev on Memorial Society, Stalinism Quagmire *[Hamburg DER SPIEGEL 13 Feb]* 65
Historical Role of Stalin, Stalinism Analyzed *[MOSCOW NEWS No 7]* 68
*Extremists' 'Antistate, Antisocialist' Activities *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 12 Feb]* 73
*Academicians Defend Zaslavskaya, Aganbegyan *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 14 Feb]* 75
MVD Official Notes Number of Labor Colonies *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Feb]* 77
Leningrad TV Debate on Death Penalty Reviewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Feb]* 78
First Issue of News Digest Published in Leningrad *[PRAVDA 12 Feb]* 78
New Science, Education Weekly in Preparation *[Moscow TV]* 79
'Moscow Tribune' Intellectuals' Club Founded *[MOSCOW NEWS No 7]* 79
Moscow Air Traffic Controllers Air Grievances *[Moscow TV]* 79

Economic

Economist Evaluates Price Control Policy *[MOSCOW NEWS No 7]* 80
Chamber of Commerce Forms Export Association *[TASS]* 81
*State-Monopoly Ownership Principle Challenged *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 10 Feb]* 81
*Plan Favors Industry Over Individual *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 8 Feb]* 83
Icebreaker Aids Transport, Saves 'Millions' *[Moscow TV]* 85

Agricultural

Further on Ligachev, Nikonov Remarks in Kharkov *[Moscow Radio]* 86
Agricultural Developments for 9-15 Feb 87

Scientific

'Molniya' Satellite Launched 15 Feb *[TASS]* 87

Military

Promotions to General, Marshal Announced *[Moscow Radio]* 87
Election Meeting Focuses on Army Restructuring *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Feb]* 88
'Special Assignment' Troops Honored Posthumously *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Feb]* 88
Soldier's Valor Described *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Feb]* 88

U.S. Delays Decision on Land-Based Missiles

LD1402221689 Moscow TASS in English 2204 GMT 14 Feb 89

[Text] Washington February 15 TASS—By TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev:

The Bush administration put off the adoption of the final decision on distribution of funds appropriated by the Congress on programmes of the modernisation of land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles. White House Press Secretary Marlin Fitzwater said Tuesday the administration is now analysing the entire complex of strategic problems facing the country, therefore, it is deemed logical and necessary to put off this important decision until the analysis is completed.

Under the law adopted last year, the White House is to send by February 15 to the U.S. Congress a report stating in what way the administration plans to spend 350 million dollars appropriated for the Pentagon for the programme of the modernisation of land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The way of many millions of dollars had been "freezed" by the Congress until the new administration informs the Congress of its "long-term intentions". The specific problem is which system of strategic armaments will be preferred: whether these funds will be used for the production and deployment of additional mobile-based MX missiles or for the speeding up of the development of Midgetman mobile-based ballistic missiles tipped with one warhead.

According to the official spokesman for the White House, the administration plans to send the report to the Congress on February 15. However the report will only explain the situation and will not contain any final decision as regards MX or Midgetman. The White House press secretary said this question is part of the analysis of the situation in the strategic area.

Observers note that the administration's decision on this matter will have long-term consequences for the entire arms control process.

FRG Deferral of Missile Project Considered

PM1502114989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Feb 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by S. Guk in Moscow and Ye. Grishin in Bonn: "Cudgels Behind Their Backs; Plans To Equip the Bundeswehr With New Missiles Deferred at Present"]

[Text] First there was the information conveyed by DPA from Bonn: "The Federal Government has deferred plans to create high-accuracy tactical missiles equipped with conventional warheads for the immediate future. As government spokesman F. Ost told the press in Bonn, Federal Chancellor H. Kohl has made the decision, in agreement with Defense Minister R. Scholz, to 'halt the implementation of this program.'"

This information was preceded by revelations made in the television program "Report." Journalist F. Alt published a FRG Ministry of Defense document codenamed KOLAS. This concept conceals a "comprehensive air attack system" intended to destroy enemy airfields. Judging from F. Alt's explanations, its characteristics are as follows: A missile with a range of up to 500 km, approaching its target, explodes over the airfield, scattering more than 40 explosive devices around it. They penetrate the concrete surface of the runway and explode underground. As a result the airfield becomes a mangled lump of earth.

This "wonder weapon" has already been worked on for 3 years, on direct instructions from Chancellor H. Kohl. It is due to replace the "Pershing-1A" missiles which the FRG Government had to give up in order to facilitate the achievement of accords between the Soviet Union and the United States on the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missile potential. The realization of the project has been entrusted to a consortium of large military concerns from the FRG and the United States.

The local press is drawing attention to the fact that the new weapon is clearly intended for offensive purposes. After all, it is being created primarily for carrying out strikes against "Eastern airfields," in the heart of socialist countries' territory. This is also attested by the missile guidance system, which allows the missile to be led to the target with an accuracy of up to 10 meters. It is also packed with highly complex electronic equipment for overcoming air defense systems. The missile can carry nuclear warheads.

The first official reaction to the disclosures of the television magazine program was that the "Report" reporters had gotten confused: The research into the possibilities for creating a new missile is purely theoretical. The second denial from Bonn was not so categorical. Only the nuclear aspect of the secret program was denied. And, finally, the news that the program has been "halted."

So, can the case of Bundeswehr "arms upgrading" that is still in the pipeline be stored away in the archives? We should not be in too much of a hurry to do this. The same DPA information report went on to say: "According to Ost's statement, Kohl and Scholz are unanimous that this option will only be completely rejected if the Vienna disarmament talks lead to a balance in conventional arms at a lower level."

All right, we should be thankful to Bonn that it has not tried to complicate the situation at the upcoming Vienna talks to reduce armed forces and conventional arms in Europe, after its secret plans have been brought out into

the open, although, no new "arms upgrading" programs—be they temporary or deferred—are likely to stimulate a successful dialogue on disarmament from the Atlantic to the Urals. And, in any case, they certainly could not be described as a contribution to disarmament. The cudgel has not been taken away, after all, but hidden behind their backs for a while.

Those who are worried about the Warsaw Pact's air forces should include this question on the agenda of the Vienna talks. This view was expressed by Egon Bahr, chairman of the Bundestag subcommission on disarmament and arms control, when he heard about the plans to equip the Bundeswehr with these missiles. He added that programs to create a new generation of weapons could nullify all efforts at disarmament.

He is not alone in this belief. The majority of West German newspaper commentaries are written in the same spirit. HAMBURGER MORGENPOST expressed itself most categorically of all: "We should not succumb to these soothing, friendly assurances from Bonn. The new German missiles will be created—it is simply a matter of time."

Yes, this is quite possible; especially since money has been allocated for the research. Creating the new weapon is no problem. But, hopes of strengthening one's security in this way are simply an illusion. No one has yet succeeded in doing this. Exactly the reverse has happened—which is now generally acknowledged. The FRG is no exception here. But undermining fragile chances of disarmament is something very real.

*Armed Forces Official on 'Parity' in Europe

WA18010189 Moscow TRUD in Russian
10 Feb 89 p 3

[Interview with Major General V.A. Kuklev, deputy chief of the General Staff Directorate, by I. Belov: "Does Parity Exist?"; date, place not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The declaration by the Warsaw Pact Defense Ministers Committee "On the Correlation of Personnel Strength of the Armed Forces and Armaments of the Warsaw Pact and NATO in Europe and Adjacent Waters" remains the focus of attention for world public opinion. The publication of this document is justifiably interpreted by many people abroad as enhancing the process of glasnost and openness in the military sphere, as yet another confirmation of the new political thinking. However, there have been skeptical statements in the West. Our correspondent had a conversation on these issues with Major General V.A. Kuklev, deputy chief of the General Staff Directorate of the Armed Forces of the USSR.

[Belov] Vladimir Aleksandrovich, why was the decision made to publish this document now, several weeks before the talks on conventional arms mandated by the Vienna meeting beginning in March?

[Kuklev] As a matter of fact, we offered to NATO to carry out an official exchange of such data as early as March 1988. Minister of Defense D.T. Yazov raised this issue during his meeting in Bern with the then U.S. Secretary of Defense F. Carlucci. Minister of Foreign Affairs E. A. Shevardnadze also spoke about it. NATO member states did not give a favorable reply to this initiative. However, in late 1988 they unilaterally published, for the purposes of propaganda, their data distorting the real picture. Following this, we made the decision to show the real correlation of forces to both the Soviet people and the world public opinion.

[Belov] For example, the newspaper THE NEW YORK TIMES writes that "estimates by the Warsaw Pact are a refutation of the NATO report published in November which used different rules of counting in order to present the military balance as tilted toward the Warsaw Pact." How would you comment on the NATO report?

[Kuklev] Before I talk about the NATO report I will dwell briefly on the Warsaw Pact document. Our comparison is based on the principle of a comprehensive approach. We take into account all components of the Armed Forces—the ground forces, the Air Force, the Navy, the air defense forces, the forces of civil (territorial) defense. The Western side has used a selective approach striving to, so to speak, "overstress" the ground forces, tanks, artillery, i. e., the components in which the Warsaw Pact has an advantage, and simultaneously "obscure" as much as possible everything pertaining to areas in which NATO enjoys numerical superiority—the Navy, attack aircraft, and so on. Here, for example, is what they include in military personnel strength: "active-duty personnel of the ground forces, including personnel of the ground support services of the Air Force." This is all. That is, all the Navy personnel and flight personnel of the Air Force are left out of the count. We think that this is the main reason for differences in the estimates of strength of the armed forces of the two military-political alliances. There are also discrepancies in the estimates of numbers of combat material. For example, the NATO document has a chapter with the quite inexact title "Main Battle Tanks" which states that the United States has 1,800 vehicles in Western Europe. In our comparison, we refer to all kinds of tanks in service—heavy, medium, light. According to our data, the number of American tanks in Europe amounts to 6,980 pieces. The difference is substantial.

As I see it, due to this, participants in the upcoming talks in Vienna will face two main tasks in the first stage: to agree on the categories of armaments, on the criteria for counting them, and to work out methods for mutual

effective verification of the data. We do not claim to be in possession of the ultimate truth and to be infallible. We are ready to consider any honest offer by our partners in the talks.

[Belov] From which sources did the Warsaw Pact obtain data on the NATO armed forces and personnel strength in Europe?

[Kuklev] We used all available sources, such as intelligence data, including that secured through national technical means.

[Belov] While expressing satisfaction in conjunction with the publication of the data on the armed forces and armaments of the Warsaw Pact, the official NATO representative still called into doubt the idea of approximate parity of the armed forces of the parties in Europe. In particular, he claimed that naval forces should not be taken into account in the balance because "they are not intended for occupying and holding territories" and are not part of the mandate of the forthcoming talks in Vienna. What is your opinion of this?

[Kuklev] Indeed, naval forces will not be a subject of the Vienna talks. However, they cannot by any means be excluded from the correlation of forces of the two alliances in Europe. As far as the NATO thesis about armaments which are supposedly "not intended for occupying and holding territories" is concerned, it is no news to us. As a matter of fact, it is advanced in order to exclude the air force and the navy from the universe considered. As it is, both ground- and carrier-based aircraft are capable of delivering powerful strikes thousands of kilometers deep within a short period of time. To be sure, all by themselves these kinds of armaments cannot occupy and hold foreign territory, but they can facilitate the achievement of such objectives in combination with other arms of the armed forces, in particular, the ground forces. The experience of World War II and subsequent regional conflicts shows that attack aircraft are, so to speak, their "instigators." Powerful air strikes, unexpected and penetrating deep, produce the initial effect which may seriously influence the outcome of hostilities. We should bear in mind that an attack by Japanese aircraft on Pearl Harbor in the years of World War II brought about considerable losses in the American Pacific Fleet.

Here is one more circumstance. If we consider the navy in a broader context; if we, say, take the marines, they are capable of both independently occupying and holding territory by themselves. This is why assertions that the navy "has got nothing to do" with the correlation of forces are unsound.

[Belov] The declaration by the Warsaw Pact clearly points to imbalances and asymmetries. Countries of the Warsaw Pact have 1.9 times more tanks, 1.5 times more infantry fighting vehicles and armored personnel carriers, 1.3 times more artillery systems. At the same time, it is shown that NATO has a fivefold advantage in large surface vessels, and an advantage of 1.5 times in attack aircraft and antitank missile systems. Our 36-fold advantage in interceptor aircraft of antiaircraft defense is unexpected. Is this a sign of us being "overzealous" in certain things while trying to achieve approximate parity?

[Kuklev] An interceptor aircraft of the air defense forces is incapable of striking ground targets. This is an utterly defensive kind of armament. It is intended for combat with the aircraft invading the airspace of the country; it is armed with air-to-air missiles, and its range of action is small. Therefore, it poses no threat to the territory of our potential opposition. As far as our advantages in other aforementioned armaments are concerned, they are due to an entire array of historical, geographical, and psychological reasons. This is attributable in part to the previous views on building our Armed Forces and the experience of the Great Patriotic War.

As a rule, the Western side has multipurpose aircraft which can operate in both the interceptor and bomber roles. They have more such aircraft. Nonetheless, I would like to note that, currently existing imbalances notwithstanding, the combat potentials of both alliances are approximately equal. It is absolutely clear now that neither side has a right to count on winning in the event of an attack. At the same time—and the declaration stresses that—it is necessary to radically reduce the present high level of concentration of armed forces and armaments in Europe in order to ensure the stability characteristic of the principle of reasonable defensive sufficiency.

[Belov] One final question. Have you taken part in arms reduction talks?

[Kuklev] Yes, I took part in the Soviet-American talks on strategic arms in Geneva, in the 1981-1983 talks on nuclear arms limitations, and in the permanent Soviet-American consultative commission which has been set up to facilitate the execution of the goals and provisions of the ABM Treaty. This is a bilateral organ which reviews, twice a year in Geneva, issues associated with the execution by the parties of the ABM Treaty and the agreement on measures reducing the danger of a nuclear war between the USSR and United States.

New Pact Commander in Chief Lushev Interviewed
LD1502142289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0755 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Text] Moscow February 15 TASS—"It has lately become very clear that as the military potential of states grows, the world becomes less secure. Warsaw Pact and NATO efforts should therefore be directed at removing confrontations," said Petr Lushev, first deputy defense minister of the USSR and commander in chief of the Joint Warsaw Pact Armed Forces. He has now taken up his new duties, having replaced Marshal Viktor Kulikov, who is now a Soviet defense inspector.

In his first interview, to TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy, General Lushev stressed that the Warsaw Pact gives priority to a reduction in levels of military confrontation, termination of the nuclear and conventional arms race, transition to phased disarmament, development of confidence-building measures, and the prevention of war.

The statement by the Defense Ministers Committee of the Warsaw Pact member states on 30 January 1989 is the result of a new approach to questions of peace and security of peoples, based on the new thinking, on the principles of openness and glasnost. "The countries of the Warsaw Pact," General Lushev stressed, "are going to the talks with a program making it possible to turn back the ruinous arms race. The Soviet Union's military budget has been reduced by 14.2 percent. In the process of disarmament in Europe a substantial contribution will be made also by other countries of the Warsaw Pact, which have announced a reduction of armed forces, armaments, and military expenditure. This is a real contribution to the preservation of peace, to solving priority questions of modern international security."

The international experience accumulated to date is making substantial corrections to the ideas of the potential of the policy of force. "The most important prerequisite of the new political thinking," said General Lushev, "is the understanding that in nuclear war there cannot be any victors, that it cannot, by force of its catastrophic consequences, be regarded as a continuation of policy by other means."

General Lushev believes that implementation of the Soviet-American INF Treaty and the prospects of a superpower agreement to reduce strategic offensive armaments warrant the conclusion that international tension is decreasing. "Today a definite abatement of the threat of a significant military clash, especially a nuclear one, is taking place," he said.

Meanwhile the Warsaw Pact countries believe that there is no guarantee of the irreversibility of the current positive processes. Therefore, in the course of the reconstruction, their armed forces are invariably kept at the required fighting efficiency and combat readiness level. "The peoples of the allied countries can be sure that the defense capacity of our states is being maintained at a reasonable level of sufficiency so that nobody should be tempted to encroach upon our security," General Lushev said in conclusion.

Petr Lushev, born in October 1923 in the Arkhangelsk region, joined the Armed Forces in 1941 as a private. During World War II he was a military school student. He was a platoon, then company, commander. He held various commanding posts in the postwar period. Upon graduation from the General Staff Academy in 1966, he became a division commander and then an Army commander. From 1975-1985 he was appointed commander in chief of a group of Soviet troops in Germany.

Warsaw Pact Defense Ministers Meet in Moscow
LD1502175189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1705 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Text] Moscow, 15 Feb (TASS)—A working meeting of Warsaw Pact member-states' defense ministers and chiefs of general (main) staffs of the allied armies took place in Moscow today.

The commander in chief and the chief of staff of the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Pact member-states took part in the meeting.

In the course of the work on issues connected with practical aspects in implementing the unilateral reductions in the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact countries and the withdrawal of some Soviet troops from the territories of the Hungarian People's Republic, the GDR, the Polish People's Republic, and the CSSR were examined. Issues of reorganizing the allied armies with a view to giving them a more defensive tendency, as well as the current activity of the Joint Armed Forces were discussed.

The meeting took place in a businesslike atmosphere and in a spirit of mutual understanding.

Defense Experts Meet in Bucharest 14-15 Feb
LD1602042789 Moscow TASS in English 1827 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Text] Bucharest February 15 TASS—A meeting of experts of Warsaw Treaty foreign and defence ministries was held in the Romanian capital on February 14-15. They examined questions of improving the mechanism of cooperation within the treaty.

Pact Foreign Ministry Delegates Meet in Warsaw
LD1402154689 Moscow TASS in English 1534 GMT 14 Feb 89

[Text] Warsaw February 14 TASS—Representatives of the foreign ministries of Warsaw Treaty countries had a working meeting in the Polish capital on February 13 and 14.

They exchanged views and information on matters connected with the implementation of accords reached at the Vienna meeting.

The foreign ministry officials were received by Polish Deputy Foreign Minister Boleslaw Kulski.

CEMA Trade Ministers Meeting Opens in Havana
LD1502110489 Moscow TASS in English 1039 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Text] Havana February 15 TASS—A conference of Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) countries' trade ministers opened at the Palace of Congresses in Havana on Tuesday. It is also being attended by the trade ministers of Angola, Laos and Nicaragua.

The meeting is summing up the implementation of cooperation programmes for scientific and technological progress and the introduction of computer technology in trade and the public catering system.

The ministers stressed the need to take account of changes in CMEA activity and coordinate efforts to develop bilateral and multilateral ties between CMEA trade ministers.

CEMA Standardization Session Held in Moscow
PM1502114189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Feb 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] The 66th (extraordinary) session of the CEMA Standing Commission on Cooperation in the Sphere of Standardization was held in Moscow on 7-8 February.

Delegations from Bulgaria, Hungary, the SRV, the GDR, the Republic of Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, the USSR, and the CSSR took part in the session.

The commission coordinated the draft report "On the State of Cooperation in the Sphere of Standardization and Proposals To Restructure Cooperation in the Interests of Its Intensification."

The session proceeded in a spirit of friendship and mutual understanding.

Perfilyev Gives Foreign Ministry Briefing

Kabul 'Relatively Calm'

LD1502231389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Text] A briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists on current issues of international politics took place at the USSR Foreign Ministry press center, on 15 February.

Touching on the situation in Afghanistan, Perfilyev, first deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, said this in particular:

[Begin Perfilyev recording] The situation in Kabul remains relatively calm, although in the country as a whole a tense military-political situation persists. In Kabul Province and in the town itself subversive activities by the opposition were stepped up. The opposition is continuing to hatch plans to capture the capital of Afghanistan.

The opposition actions on the Kabul-Hayratan route, especially on the section of this highway between Kabul and Charikar, are also being intensified. As a whole the Hayratan-Kabul road remains under the control of the government troops and is functioning normally.

Moreover, the Afghan military air transport is regularly transporting national economy cargoes along the Kabul-Qandahar, Kabul-Mazar-e Sharif, and Qandahar-Shindand routes.

The situation remains complicated in other Afghan provinces, especially in Nangarhar Province, in the Khowst District, where the opposition continues to reinforce its grouping. Here, too, the agitation among servicemen and attempts to win them over to the opposition side have been increased.

The Pakistani authorities are encouraging the Afghan armed opposition to expedite the creation of an interim government made up of Afghan rebel representatives. The impasse that has arisen in the matter of holding meetings of the Afghan Consultative Council, that is to say, the Shura, has still not been overcome. The two main issues—on the quantitative representation of the Iran-based, eight-party alliance and on reconciliation within the Alliance of Seven between fundamentalist and partly moderate elements and Mojaddedi, leader of the National Liberation Front of Afghanistan, remained unresolved for the time being.

Meanwhile, the idea of a confederation of Islamic Pakistan and Afghanistan is still afloat in Pakistan, in ruling circles as well. Being vigorously pushed through by the most conservative forces in Pakistan, this idea obviously proceeds from the need to establish a fundamentalist regime in Kabul.

It is hardly appropriate during these days that are decisive for the future of the Afghan people, to revive the ideas that were put forward by Ziaul Haq and can in no way contribute to a course of events that are favorable and meet the interests of the Afghan people in the direction of a settlement in Afghanistan.

Against this background, the statement by Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto, which she made upon her return from Beijing, to the effect that, I quote, Pakistan has recognized the concept of a political settlement in Afghanistan, seems realistic to us. [end recording]

Last Soviet Soldier Leaves

LD1502145589 Moscow TASS in English 1439 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Text] Moscow February 15 TASS—"There is not a single Soviet soldier on the territory of the Republic of Afghanistan today, February 15", Vadim Perfilyev, first deputy head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, said beginning a briefing on Wednesday. Being firmly committed to its obligations under the Geneva agreements, the Soviet Union has withdrawn all of its troops from that country.

Touching on the situation around Afghanistan, Perfilyev noted that the Pakistani authorities encourage the Afghan armed oposition to expedite the formation of an interim government composed of Afghan rebels' representatives. However, there was no breakthrough in the statemate that has arisen during the meetings of the Afghan consulative council. The two main issues—on the quantitative representation of the Iran-based eight-party alliance and on reconciliation within the alliance of the seven—remain unresolved.

The idea of forming a "confederation of Islamic Pakistan and Afghanistan" is still afloat in Pakistan. Its proponents proceed from the need to establish a fundamentalist regime in Kabul. Against this background, "the statement by Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto to the effect that Pakistan has recognised the concept of political settlement in Afghanistan seems realistic". Perfilyev said.

The Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said that there were more than a hundred journalists in Afghanistan at the concluding stage of Soviet troop withdrawal. They were accorded, in part, an opportunity to monitor the operation of "air bridge" through which food is delivered to Kabul and to meet armed opposition representatives who have switched sides.

Commenting on the meeting of presidents of five Central American countries in San Salvador, Perfilyev described it as "one more important step in implementing the Guatemala accords in support of which the Soviet Union and all those who are interested in the establishment of peace and stability in the region have declared from the outset".

He particularly noted the flexible and constructive stand of the Nicaraguan leadership, which was largely instrumental in the making of several fundamentally important decisions, first and foremost, on the issue of Contras' repatriation from Honduran territory.

Expressing confidence that the Nicaraguan side will fulfill the commitments assumed within the fixed timeframe and in full, Perfilyev said: "One would like to hope that other states in the region will make an adequate contribution to the implemeentation of the understandings reached".

Gorbachev Thanks UN for Armenian Quake Aid

LD1602110989 Moscow TASS in English 0822 GMT 16 Feb 89

[Text] New York February 16 TASS—The USSR's permanent representative at the United Nations Aleksandr Belonogov visited U.N. Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar on Wednesday and handed over to him the text of a message from Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev. The message expressed on behalf of the Soviet leadership and all Soviet people gratitude to the U.N. Secretary-General, U.N. Secretariat employees and U.N. specialised agencies for moral and material support which was given in eliminating the aftermath of an earthquake in Armenia.

The worldwide campaign of solidarity with Armenia has shown once again that positive changes are taking place in the present-day interdependent world, it testified to universal awareness of the responsibility for the future of the peoples and countries. Jointly we can and should oppose the elements, solve mankind's global problems and build our common home, the [message] says.

UN's Cordovez Supports Withdrawal From Afghanistan

LD1602044889 Moscow TASS in English 2228 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Text] New York February 16 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev.

Diego Cordovez, representative of the U.N. secretary-general on a settlement of the Afghanistan situation, spoke of "exemplary" fulfilment by the Soviet Union of its obligations under the Geneva accords and in particular the strictest observance of the time-frame for the troop withdrawal envisaged by them.

These conclusions, he told journalists accredited to the U.N. on Wednesday, are contained in a report drafted by him on behalf of the U.N. Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan, which will be submitted to the Security Council. Under the conditions of glasnost (openness), Cordovez noted, the Soviet Union ensured a broad coverage of the last stage of the troop withdrawal, and all pressmen could get convinced of its completion.

He said that, despite some allegations, the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan does not mean "an end of the Geneva agreements." Now it is necessary "to carry them out in an integrated manner." Today the way is open for establishment of peace in Afghanistan, Cordovez emphasised. He called on Afghans to use this chance, noting that only they can tackle problems of their country, and all other parties should help them settle their affairs as they think proper.

The tragic events in Afghanistan showed that military approaches would not help a settlement, that they could only aggravate the tragedy and that a domestic settlement was only possible through a political process, he pointed out. Now the main thing is to achieve a strict observance of provisions on non-interference, provided for by the Geneva accords, so as to create such a regional climate in which the rights and interests of all will be ensured. In this context he pointed out that this concerns all the governments and states in the region, including Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iran.

Cordovez expressed the hope that the Afghans would be able to settle their problems without outside interference and without fanning up hatred.

Expressing his opinion on the further development of Soviet-Afghan relations, Cordovez said that they had long-standing history of the closest cooperation and friendship. The USSR is a more developed country, and Afghanistan is interested in its aid. Even those representatives of the opposition who told him that they "deeply resented" the Soviet Union, favoured friendly and not hostile relations between the two countries, said the representative of the U.N. secretary-general.

EEC Integration, 'Common European Home' Viewed

PM1502144989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Feb 89 First Edition p 7

[T. Kolesnichenko article: "When Zero Hour Comes"]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] The path toward a "Europe without frontiers," and even more so a "United States of Europe" (the most ambitious objective) is incredibly complex. Moreover, I would venture to be dubious about the very date—31 Decemnber 1992—as of when all frontiers and customs barriers to the free movement of capital and individuals within the EEC are due to be abolished, to be followed by the creation of a single bank, a single currency, a uniform tax system, and so forth. The objective and subjective obstacles are innumerable. [passage omitted]

But whenever the EEC's zero hour comes, it will not be able to solve the radical problems of Europe, if only because true Europe extends from the Atlantic to the Urals, and no "United States of Europe" as proclaimed in the West of our continent is able to ignore this real geographical and political factor. The interrelationship

and interdependence of the world, for all its contradictions, is a philosophical postulate with which we are increasingly coming to grasp, with greater insight, and which is projected onto European problems. That is why the idea of a "common European home" rather than the division of Europe (Kissinger even proposes drawing a demarcation line "along the Soviet-Polish border") accords with the true interests of all Europeans.

We, of course, have no intention of giving up borders and "merging" with West Europe. The "common European home" is not a communal apartment. But a "border" represents, according to Kissinger, a deep watershed, a new "Iron Curtain" between capitalist Europe and socialist states. European countries, if you pursue this logic, are doomed to military confrontation, mutual isolation, and stockpiling of arms by each side.

After M.S. Gorbachev's UN address and the results of the Vienna meeting, the former U.S. secretary of state's arguments are a patent anachronism. To be fair, I should say that other winds are now blowing in West Europe itself. The idea of all-European cooperation and concerted efforts to solve urgent problems like the environment and the fight against drugs, AIDS, and terrorism is already being put into practice.

The effective development of economic cooperation between the EEC and CEMA is also on the agenda. West European integration and the integration of socialist countries are opening up new opportunities for the European market and mutually beneficial trade free of all discrimination. There are many problems here, including on our side. While we have finally "recognized" the EEC, we have still not created the economic structures necessary for a real "leap forward" in economic ties with the Common Market. If we are to achieve a tangible result we must make our own market more flexible and establish the production of high-quality goods capable of competing on the international market. But the very fact that these tasks have now actually been set by restructuring speaks volumes. We will not beat the drum yet, but it is clear that the only correct path has been chosen.

However paradoxical it may seem, the most complicated economic problems prove easier to solve than political ones. And yet "little" is required here—just common sense and the abandonment of ossified stereotypes. Unfortunately, far from everyone in the United States and West Europe has drawn this conclusion. At best, we hear from certain leaders there calls for "caution" and "careful verification" of Soviet initiatives. At worst, we see the spreading of rumors and suspicion regarding even our disarmament—all this is, allegedly, a ploy designed to "disrupt NATO," "separate Europe from the United States," "dull Europeans' vigilance," and so forth. You won't build a common European home on those foundations, of course.

It cannot be said that this is not appreciated in the EEC. And although they are meanwhile putting forward their own conception of the common European home there, the grain of rationality in it is highly visible. This is what Jacques Delors says, for example: "It is a house called the European Community of which we ourselves are the sole builder and whose keys we will carefully look after, which does not exclude a readiness to open our doors for trade with neighbors."

That, of course, is not yet a Europe "from the Atlantic to the Urals," but nor is it any longer a "border under lock and key" or a call to create an "exclusive grouping." When you trade you don't fight. A stable world needs both a "small Europe" and a "large Europe"—from the Atlantic to the Urals.

Only in conditions of mutual trust can the integration processes in the western and eastern parts of our continent produce real fruit. It is important that they should work to benefit all European civilization rather than divide Europe. This is the only sensible route. And only by following it can some kind of mutually beneficial manner of combining the economic processes in both parts of Europe be found.

And that perhaps is when the zero hour which the Common Market is striving for so assiduously will come. And not just for the EEC but for the whole of Europe.

*Domestic, U.S., PRC 'Closed' Areas Examined

WA18000523a Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Feb 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences Yevgeniy Bazhanov: "Closed Landscape. Thoughts of an International Observer on Closed and Open Zones in the USSR, the United States, and the PRC"]

[Text] **I read in IZVESTIYA (No 361, 1988) the article "I Cannot See My Son..." and wanted to discuss a little what was written in it. It was a question of closed zones and cities and the ordeals that people have to endure because of them.**

We have many closed regions, particularly in the eastern part of the country. True, some steps to reduce them are being initiated, but the process is slow and strained. Numerous interested ministries and departments oppose this, according to the press. And moreover, as usual, they are putting the blame on each other: Well, they say, we are agreeable, but our "subcontractors" or our "neighbors" and so forth are throwing a wrench in the wheel....

Until it becomes clear who is "for" this and who "against," who is for restructuring and who has already restructured, or, contrariwise, is not about the restructure, we shall continue to express the strongest dissatisfaction. A wife cannot go the join her husband, a brother cannot visit his sisters.

It is not only people who are suffering, but also our country's economic and political interests.

Of course, the opponents of change have solid arguments: security, protection of the borders, traditions, sparse population, high percentage of military people, and so forth. They have arguments and are against the counterarguments. It is no good making references to the fact that this is a age of satellites and that from space it is possible to see everything, not only the forbidden trees but also what has been built of placed between them. No impression can be made by the conclusion that by concealing and hiding we lose the trust of our neighbors and sometimes cause them unjustified alarm. Who knows that is there on Kamchatka or up in the tayga, a warehouse or a new superweapon that no one else in the world has thought of. Imagine: One evening along the edge of the forest you meet two strangers. One has his hands in view and is carrying nothing. The other has a gun hidden in his pocket. Is he cold? Or perhaps he has prepared something heavy or sharp for you.

But I repeat, these arguments hold no water. And this is what I thought: What if we compare our situation with, say the United States and China, the other two great powers. How do they safeguard their secrets? That they do hide things is, of course, a fact, but they do it somewhat differently.

At a scientific conference in 1974 in the Californian city of Long Beach I got to know the elderly, gray-haired Professor Tyorston [transliterated]. As we talked it became clear that my interlocutor had in the past served in the State Department where he had been employed in dealing with the Soviet Union. Once, Secretary of State Dulles had sent for him and his colleagues and given them an order: "The Russians, he says, have closed part of their territory and we must get our own back." They set about complying with his order. They thought and thought for a long time and then decided to act on the principle of analogues. So, if the Volga is closed in the USSR then in the United States people will be allowed only restricted access to its American counterpart—the Mississippi. Since Leningrad is open, the Russians will be permitted to visit New York, but as soon as the port city and naval base at Vladivostok is closed, then by analogy we must close all roads leading to San Diego. The idea pleased the higher-ups and they accepted it.

As the result of this, let us say candidly, mocking closure (not out of necessity but out of revenge), diplomats working in the USSR Consulate in San Francisco (among them the author of this article) could not use Highway 1. Why? The local representative of the State Department, a charming woman, explained with a smile: "Highway 1 goes along the coast of the Pacific and it is very beautiful; we are depriving Soviet diplomats of the satisfaction of enjoying nature so as to provide an incentive for them to 'lean' on Moscow and demand an end to the closed regions in the Soviet Union." Instead of going along Highway 1 when traveling to Los Angeles (which was quite often) we were forced to travel along Highway 5, which runs through a hot and boring desert.

And our diplomats had to travel to Seattle by car or train (more than 1,300 kilometers). It was possible to fly but...the road from the airport in Seattle to the city was regarded as "closed." Why? Because it ran along the factories of the Boeing aerospace corporation. Was that logical, you say? Not really. The fact is that in Boeing, which wanted Soviet orders, they welcomed us with open arms and invited us in. And this is how it was: A consultant would fly to Seattle airport, where he was met by a helicopter and a Boeing representative. The guest was taken to the city center by air, landing on the roof of the Boeing skyscraper headquarters.

However, sometimes it was possible to manage without those kinds of ruses. All that had to be done was add to the travel application a note asking for permission to travel in a closed area "as an exception," and the State Department allowed us to enjoy the "secret" ocean or travel alongside the Boeing factories. But in return, American diplomats in the USSR immediately demanded some exception for themselves, and in our Ministry of Foreign Affairs they did not like this and our consulate was criticized for "lack of discipline."

There were other ways of avoiding the procedure. Sometimes we asked the State Department people in San Francisco to allow us into some particular closed area just like that, not as an exception. And since they were gentle people they used to say "go ahead!" It was in this way, incidentally, that I visited the closed area at Long Beach, where I met with Professor Tyorston.

I did not have to work particularly hard to win those kinds of indulgences. For the restrictions were artificial. They did not apply to the representatives of most other countries, and the bans did not apply at all to Soviet tourists, sportsmen, scientists, and artists. This does not mean that they trusted us all in everything. The newspaper people periodically used to make a fuss about "Soviet espionage," and there were people who were very displeased that diplomats from the USSR were appearing in places where defense objects were concentrated. Later, when the detente of the seventies ebbed and there was a relapse into the "cold war" in the early eighties, some of those areas were directly closed.

Nevertheless...it was not additional sanctions and supervigilant keepers of secrets that made the weather. Even among the military, common sense prevailed over mindless panic. Two minutes away from our consulate in San Francisco, in the Presidio, was located the headquarters of the U.S. Sixth Army. It contained what you might expect: guns, tanks, helicopters (just a few), a parade ground, barracks, officers' quarters (each with a board showing the rank and name of the owner), and so forth. Alongside was a football field, basketball courts, squash courts. They belong to the municipal authorities, and

there from morning until night military people and civilians from all over the city improve their health. And we used to join them. Sometimes there was no space on the municipal grounds and the consulate workers played on sports areas belonging directly to the Pentagon. The officers did not object and even allowed us to go in front of them in the line for tennis.

One could go on with these examples from life in America, from which it can be seen that the keeping of secrets need not involve laying thousands of kilometers of barbed wire. But now let us turn to the PRC.

Even a decade ago China was one of the most closed countries in the world. Most of its territory was inaccessible to foreigners. But even where it was possible to visit it was not possible to buy newspapers, talk with the local inhabitants, dine in the same place with them, photograph official establishments, or visit particular areas in cities. At the entrances to such areas there were signs in Chinese, Russian, and English announcing the ban.

The new economic policy proclaimed by the CCP Central Committee in 1978 broke down the earlier procedures. It was decided to open wide the doors to the outside world and develop businesslike cooperation with foreign partners in every possible way. Previously, for example, the southern part of Guangdong, which is contiguous to Hong Kong and Macao, had been a forbidden zone. There the border guards bossed the show and the little villages vegetated and were barely able to make both ends meet. It was, one might say, a godforsaken corner of the world, but the special economic zones of Shenzhen and Zhuhai have now been established there. Foreign capital has been given extensive rights in the zones, and Shenzhen and Zhuhai compare with the most prosperous countries of Asia.

Fourteen of the cities on the Pacific littoral were given special status, including those where PRC naval bases are located—Qingdao, Ningbo, Shantou, Guangzhou, Weihai, and so forth. In 1988 the onetime top secret Hainan Island was made a special zone. Foreigners are now not only permitted to visit these places but are even induced to go there. It is being proposed that trading companies, insurance firms, and consulting firms be established there.

And what about the military? How are they reacting to all this? The naval ships stand in the roads at Ningbo. Foreign tourists photograph them from the shore. The most curious can go aboard them. In Guangzhou I observed sailors sweating to unload Japanese television sets and refrigerators from a freighter, and at Weihai they were selling little Toyotas in the domestic market. On the little island at the south end of Hainan there is a monkey garden. The road to it runs through a military section. The guard, knowing that I was from the USSR, and my companions from the FRG and Italy, wanted to take a photograph of us for a keepsake, alongside the weapons that he was guarding. "All Europeans look the same to me," he joked as we parted.

In a food house in Shanghai I spoke with an Englishwoman. She had learned Russian in London and wanted to travel to the Soviet Union. But Intourist had demanded an exorbitant price and, moreover, offered a guided tour. The Englishwoman preferred China. No one asked her anything and she had been traveling about for a year with her small daughter around the cities and countryside of China. She mapped out her own extended route independently. She travels on the overloaded buses and sails the seas and rivers in the holds of ships. At night she stays at inns, and she eats with the Chinese working people. And what is most surprising of all, she does not know a single word of Chinese. In exactly the same way, students from France and nurses from Austria travel around China. Some on foot, others on bicycles, yet others begging lifts in cars.

But, the closed areas still remain. But, the bans are not always in force. The Englishwoman mentioned above told me how once by mistake she found herself in a closed populated area. It was only on the second day that representatives of the local authorities asked her to leave the area. It should be borne in mind, incidentally, that foreigners are not allowed into areas not for security considerations but because of the lack of hotels and everything that a guest might need.

No one, of course, need copy either the Americans or the Chinese. But they do provide some food for thought.

United States & Canada

Bush Discusses Relations With Soviet Union

Carrying Out Policy Review

PM1602104789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Feb 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "G. Bush's Interview"]

[Text] New York, 15 Feb—U.S. President George Bush gave an interview to THE WALL STREET JOURNAL in which he touched on a number of foreign policy problems.

He said the following with regard to relations with the Soviet Union: "I have already said that there are tremendous new opportunities and problems and I still hold this opinion. When something good happens and when tension between the Soviet Union and the United States lessens because the Soviet Union makes a good move like withdrawing from Afghanistan, we should be very delighted. I am less skeptical than some people about the Soviet Union's readiness and desire to fulfill its promises. That is why I say that this is a good thing. But there are still many other problems here."

"I am someone," the head of the White House continued, "who considers—and I really believe this—that we are possibly on the verge of something truly historic in our relations with the Soviet Union. But at present we should carry out an exhaustive analysis of the problem and possibly gain a better understanding of what is going on in the Soviet Union before we begin to bring our plans to fruition. Our best specialists, who are tackling all this, have different views. That is why it's hard to say. As for Afghanistan, the Russians promised that they would leave and they have left and we should welcome the withdrawal of their troops."

Bush Seen as 'Extremely Cautious'

LD1502212189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Text] The U.S. newspaper THE WALL STREET JOURNAL has published an interview with U.S. President Bush in which the question of Soviet-U.S. relations was touched upon in particular. We offer for your attention a "Mayak" commentary.

Its author, Andrey Ptashnikov, is at the microphone.

[Ptashnikov] It is by no means the first time that Bush has been dwelling on the prospects for relations with the Soviet Union. And there is nothing new in what he told THE WALL STREET JOURNAL correspondent. Bush reaffirmed his extremely cautious approach to the future development of relations with our country. In this connection he stated literally the following: Before we start implementing our plans we must carry out an exhaustive analysis of the problem and we must understand as best as possible what is taking place in the USSR.

As you can see, compared with other Bush speeches, his position has indeed not undergone any changes. And, all the same, I want to dwell on two of his statements. The first concerns the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. The President assessed this event as follows: When tension between the USSR and the United States decreases, thanks to the fact that the Soviet Union is undertaking something good, of the type of the withdrawal from Afghanistan, we must be very glad of that and I am very glad of that.

Well then, Bush's joy is perfectly understandable. The entire world is today welcoming the actions of our country, which has completely fulfilled the obligations it took on under the Geneva agreements. But, after all, it is well known that international politics is a two-way street. And a legitimate question arises: When will the United States, as one more guarantor of the Geneva accords, also do something good and make the world happy, make its contribution to a just solution of the Afghan problem?

You must agree, comrades, the decision made the other day by the White House to continue giving aid to the Afghan opposition as long as the present government is in power obviously does not contribute to the achievement of this aim.

And, in conclusion, a few words on Bush's position on the normalization of Soviet-U.S. trade ties. In the interview to THE WALL STREET JOURNAL he stated that if on the part of the USSR specific steps are taken which meet the interests of peace, we, the United States, must realize this, give the Soviet Union its due, and not be unfriendly.

Judging from this statement, Bush, just like his predecessor, intends to make trade relations between the USSR and the United States dependent on our country's foreign policy. It would be appropriate for the new U.S. President to recall that such a course by the White House has already proved its complete inconsistency.

Baker's Foreign Diplomatic Tour Reported

UK Suggests Easing Cocom Curbs

PM1602082789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Feb 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by correspondent A. Krivopalov: "James Bakers' Diplomatic Tour: The New U.S. Secretary of State Holds a Series of Consultations With the NATO Allies"]

[Text] London—J. Baker's first stopover was in Iceland and was followed by London. Many principled questions connected with the diplomatic tour of 15 capitals (in 8 days) were undoubtedly "aired" during Baker's conversations with the British leadership.

The new leader of the State Department and the head of the Foreign Office became acquainted long ago—back in the days when they were both in charge of their country's finances. The trip was "undertaken primarily to elaborate consistency of actions," was how Baker summed up his mission.

The NATO allies, presumably, have things to say to Baker. The West European countries expect that the United States will respond seriously to the philosophically considered concept of international relations—now and in the long term—proposed by the USSR.

It is interesting that it was none other than Sir Geoffrey Howe—Baker's first interlocutor in London—whose mild, well-rounded, almost Pickwickian appearance conceals a very harsh and at times aggressive character, who raised the question that the export restrictions of COCOM (an organization imposed by the United States on its West European partners) should surely now be eased.

This episode was recalled by THE GUARDIAN's diplomatic editor Hella Pick, whose information sources are usually reliable: "Now, Sir Geoffrey said, when the last Soviet soldiers are leaving Afghanistan, the time has come to raise the curtain of restrictions and examine—case by case—the request to reduce the COCOM list of goods banned for export to the Soviet Union. Mr Baker recalled that the United States approaches this matter without prejudice but time for thought is needed here."

In London the secretary of state also spoke, of course, about NATO's arms control strategy. He was received by M. Thatcher at the British head of government's country residence. This year marks the 40th anniversary of the North Atlantic Alliance. The leaders of the countries constituting the North Atlantic bloc will meet at the end of May in Brussels, where NATO headquarters is located. The aim of the meeting is not so much ceremonial as working. The summit meeting, according to the scheme of the policymakers in Washington and London, should be used to convince the world public of the West's constructive and resourceful diplomacy.

As for disarmament questions, during Baker's London stopover it was noted that it is necessary to modernize NATO's tactical nuclear weapons on the pretext that NATO must maintain its deterrent forces at a modern level and not include the question of them in the current rounds of arms control talks.

'Lightning Visit' to Greece

PM1602113789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Feb 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Correspondent A. Nikolayev dispatch: "J. Baker's 'Lightning Visit' to Athens"]

[Text] Athens—A "lightning visit" is what journalists are calling the talks between U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker, A. Papandreou, head of the Greek Government, and Foreign Minister K. Papoulias, whose conversations lasted a total of 1 and ½ hours.

NATO problems, East-West relations, cooperation in the struggle against terrorism, and U.S.-Greek bilateral relations—that was the order in which J. Baker listed the U.S. side's priorities in the talks in a brief statement on their completion. The Greek side mentioned the problems of Europe, the Near East, and Central America among the topics discussed in addition to that list. K. Papoulias, who arrived in Athens from Madrid toward the end of the U.S. visitor's short stay in Greece, briefed his colleague on the results of the talks that had just ended between the so-called "Three" (the foreign ministers of Greece, Spain, and France) and the leaders of Egypt, Jordan, and Syria within the context of the EEC's efforts for a settlement of the Near East problem. As the Greek minister noted, the United States displayed "heightened interest" in this aspect.

The U.S.-Greek talks in Athens certainly centered on quite a complicated complex of bilateral relations, the crux of which is the question of the future of the Pentagon bases in Greece. The 14th round of the relevant talks, which has just ended, produced no results.

Redman Says Aid to Afghan Rebels Will Continue

LD1502233189 Moscow TASS in English 2313 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Text] Washington February 16 TASS—The United States does not intend to stop arms supplies to the Afghan opposition after the withdrawal of Soviet troops from that country and to accept repeated Soviet proposals made simultaneously to all countries, including the U.S.A. and the USSR, to end arms deliveries to the warring sides.

This was the essence of a reply by U.S. State Department spokesman Charles Redman to a question by a TASS correspondent about the attitude of the U.S. Administration to the Soviet proposal.

Redman said on Wednesday that he had nothing new to say on this score. He repeated what he said in the past: The U.S. support for the opposition would continue. Asked what would be the aims of the U.S. policy towards Afghanistan in connection with the new situation in that country, Redman said that the U.S. aims had not changed. The U.S. aim was and remains support for Afghan self-determination, he added.

China

Marchuk, Delegation Sign Document, End Visit

LD1602105689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0938 GMT 16 Feb 89

[Text] Beijing, 16 Feb—TASS correspondents Andrey Kirillov and Vyacheslav Tomilin report: The visit to the PRC by a delegation of the USSR Academy of Sciences, headed by its president, G.I. Marchuk, ended today with the signing of an agreement on direct cooperation between establishments of the Academies of Sciences of

the Soviet Union and China. The document envisages the exchange of information on subjects which are of mutual interest, the holding of joint scientific conferences and symposiums, and the creation of temporary international collectives for conducting joint research.

The sides also agreed on the main areas of cooperation between the two academies up to the year 2000 in the area of physical, technical, and mathematical sciences; chemistry and biology; scientific instrument building; and a number of other branches of knowledge.

Cooperation in the most important areas of fundamental and applied sciences is becoming more and more characteristic of Soviet-Chinese scientific cooperation, said G.I. Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, to the TASS correspondents. Contacts between sociologists are also becoming active. This year, for example, will see the first Soviet-Chinese symposium on questions of economic and political reform. Direct contacts between scientific organizations of border regions are acquiring specific content—scientists of Kazakhstan, Kirghizia, Uzbekistan, Siberia, and the Far East are successfully cooperating with their colleagues from the provinces of Heilongjiang and the Xinjiang Uighur autonomous region.

The present visit by the Soviet delegation is an important step on the way to developing cooperation between scientists of the two countries, declared Zhou Guangzhao, president of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, in an interview with TASS correspondents. We share the view of our Soviet colleagues on the need for international cooperation by people of science, including our two socialist countries. Indeed, we are faced with many common problems. Chinese scientists always keenly follow the development of science and technology in the USSR. We can draw no small positive experience from this, noted the Chinese scientist.

Nakhodka Party Chief on Far East Economic Zone

OW1402071389 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0300 GMT 10 Feb 89

[Report on SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA interview with Narinov, first secretary of the Nakhodka City party committee]

[Text] Following is a SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA interview with Narinov, first secretary of the Nakhodka City party committee, on the prospects of establishing special economic zones and developing joint ventures in the Soviet Far East: This is what Narinov says: [Male announcer] I believe what we should do today is, of course, to take reasonable measures to establish share-holding joint ventures and attract foreign laborers, in order to develop and upgrade the technology of the coastal maritime region. Indeed, we are short of labor, but it is available, because neighboring China and Korea are willing to send cheap labor.

[Female announcer] According to some scientists, a large amount of funds is needed to process the traditional resources of the coastal maritime region and manufacture new products with advanced science and technology.

[Male announcer] In my view, it is simple, as well as effective, to process the resources and recycled materials through setting up joint ventures. This is the only way for us to learn the expertise in production management and international exchanges. To the Soviet Union today, the establishment of joint ventures is a practical way of joining the international production process. Differences remain, however, such as the fear of being put into a dependent position. I think that, if we agree to become a raw-material-supplying country for developed countries, we would sell ourselves into slavery. Although old concepts die hard today, as long as we have decided to set up a zone of joint ventures in Nakhodka, we must see to it that they are able to develop rapidly and become the backbone of the future special economic zone. It would be meaningless if the economic zone were to be surrounded by all departments' [ge bu] fortified indifference to new practices, as it is now. Take, for example, our negotiations with the Chinese on the construction of a hotel for promoting tourism in the maritime region, in which the Soviet International Travel Agency will participate. They asked for our expectations. We said it would be profitable. No, let us build the hotel ourselves. The Chinese asking price of U.S.$17 million from the Soviet International Travel Agency for the construction of the hotel is cheap, and our investment will yield quick profit.

[Female announcer] As the first secretary of the city party committee, are you familiar with the market?

[Male announcer] Regrettably, I am far from being a professional expert. It should be pointed out that economic exchanges with foreign countries is a very important component of political affairs. Therefore, as a party secretary, I have attached a great importance to this issue. Besides, I have traveled extensively and seen many places, including the United States and Japan, which I know as well as I know my own country. I am convinced that Nakhodka's future is bright. We shall succeed in building, not only a special economic zone, but also an oasis.

Northeast Asia

75 Percent of Soviet Troops To Leave Mongolia

OW1502140589 Ulaanbaatar International Service in English 1200 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Text] Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union Rogachev has held a news conference in Ulaanbaatar. He gave a high appraisal of this working visit to Mongolia and his meaningful talks with Mongolian party leader and President Batmonh, Foreign Minister Gombosuren, and First Deputy Foreign Minister Yondon. Rogachev said that they exchanged views on a broad circle of

questions, starting from the question of raising the efficiency of Mongolian-Soviet cooperation and ending with the topical problems of the Asia-Pacific region, in particular the questions of the present state and future development of Soviet-Chinese relations and the state of Mongolian-Chinese relations.

Igor Rogachev voiced satisfaction over the achievement of an agreement on the upcoming working visit of Batmonh to the Soviet Union and the signing in Ulaanbaatar of a cooperation plan between the Foreign Ministries of the Soviet Union and Mongolia for 1989 and the plan of interaction of the two ministries in the Asia-Pacific region. The Soviet minister termed the document an important one envisaging close cooperation of the two countries in this important part of the globe.

Concerning the question of solving the Kampuchean problem, the Soviet deputy foreign minister said that not a single foreign force should interfere in the internal affairs of the Kampuchean people. Rogachev highly appraised the policy of national reconciliation conducted by the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

Dwelling on Soviet-Chinese relations, Igor Rogachev spoke of the outcome of the official visit of Eduard Shevardnadze to China. Rogachev said that there was every reason to expect from the coming Soviet-Chinese summit in May complete normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations.

Soon Soviet-Mongolian talks on the final solution of the entire complex of questions connected with the withdrawal from the territory of Mongolia of 75 percent of the Soviet land forces and other military subunits will begin, said Rogachev at the news conference.

DPRK, ROK Agree on Joint Projects in USSR

LD1602121389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0620 GMT 16 Feb 89

[Excerpt] Moscow, 16 Feb (TASS)—The DPRK and South Korea have reached agreement on joint participation in carrying out projects for the development of Soviet Siberia and the Far East without a specific agreement with the USSR. This was reported in an interview to the magazine NOVOYE VREMYA by Mikhail Kuryachev, a representative of the Chamber of Trade and Industry of the USSR. In particular he deals with questions of the development of Soviet-South Korean economic relations.

As yet it is difficult to speak of the nature of that agreement and about the prospects which it is opening up: We are not familiar with the content of the document, he said. [passage omitted]

Panmunjon Inter-Korean Talks Viewed

PM1602145389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Feb 89 First Edition p 7

[Correspondent S. Tikhomirov dispatch: "It Is Snowing in Seoul...."]

[Text] Panmunjom-Pyongyang, 11 Feb—"Is it snowing in Seoul?"

"Yes... But has the ice gone from the Taedong-gang?"

"Not yet. But it is, by all accounts, on the point of moving."

It was these phrases, which impose no obligation, that originally began the conversation at the first round of the preliminary meeting to prepare for military-political talks between the heads of government of North and South Korea. The hosts of the meeting, albeit formal hosts, were southerners, since its participants—an impressive "force" of journalists—gathered in the settlement of Panmunjom, which is 100 meters south of the demarcation line dividing the Korean peninsula in two.

There was special interest in the meeting, but the degree of interest was determined not only by the number of journalists who arrived in Panmunjom. There were representatives of major Western newspapers, correspondents from the United States, Canada, and Japan, and Soviet journalists.

The very fact that the talks were held is very significant—the inter-Korean dialogue is continuing. This, by the way, was noted in his speech, by Pak Nam-chun, head of the DPRK delegation, who stated that "talks between North and South in various areas are now being prepared, and on the whole the situation is developing favorably in the direction of detente and dialogue."

And they are not only being "prepared." Literally a week before the present meeting, Chong Chu-yong, honorary chairman of "Hyundai," one of South Korea's largest firms, visited the DPRK. At the Pyongyang talks a whole series of essentially unprecedented agreements was reached concerning, in particular, the development of the tourism infrastructure in the Diamond Mountains in the north of the DPRK. And although it is essential to get official agreement from both countries' governments before they begin to implement these plans, it can already be said with some certainty that the go-ahead for this will be received both in Pyongyang and in Seoul.

So the first round of the preliminary meeting to prepare for the military-political talks between government heads has ended. But the 2 hours during which the sides exchanged ideas concerning the agenda and other procedural questions of the impending meeting between the two countries' premiers were not enough to reach specific positive accords. And not because the time limit was exhausted.

The stumbling block which hampered the meeting participants and which could have been circumvented or even removed from the path of talks altogether, was inordinately "heavy." I am referring to the U.S.-South Korean "Team Spirit-89" maneuvers which have begun. The DPRK considered them a provocation, deciding to put off the next meeting on the preparation of the interparliamentary forum between North and South planned for 10 February until the end of the military exercises. For its part, South Korea denies the maneuvers have an aggressive thrust and even indicates its readiness to take northern observers on them.

But, as Major General Choe Ui-ung, chief delegate on the Korean-Chinese side of the military commission on the armistice in Korea, told a PRAVDA correspondent "the maneuvers from the 'Team Spirit' series are aggressive, and for this reason the invitation to them of DPRK and Chinese observers is a provocation."

...The official smiles and handshakes by the delegation heads at the end of the talks aroused a kind of vague sense of dissatisfaction. And, probably, not only among those who observed the meeting's progress. The several kilometers of "washboard" paving blocks along which we returned from Panmunjom kept the driver constantly in a state of tension: It was slippery and dangerous. The car's windshield wipers were having trouble wiping away the large flakes of wet snow on the windshield. In Panmunjom the weather had not cleared up...

DPRK General Comments on Dialogue With South

PM1502165589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Feb 89 First Edition p3

[TASS report: "With Optimism Nevertheless"]

[Text] Kaesong, 13 Feb—We are optimistic about the future of contacts between North and South Korea, Major General of the Korean People's Army Choe Ui-ung, chief delegate of the Korean-Chinese side in the military commission on an armistice in Korea, said.

The north regards the solution of problems concerning political and military detente in the peninsula as central to its dialogue with the south of the country, the general noted. He was giving an interview after the first meeting—on 8 February in Panmunjom—to prepare for military-political talks between the sides at prime minister level. Although this meeting has not produced instantaneous results, it was useful nevertheless, as it has started the discussion of topical problems. It is now important to remove the mistrust that has been building up for a long time between the two parts of the country. Precisely for this reason, the DPRK is insisting on the termination of the joint U.S.-South Korean military maneuvers, "Team Spirit-89," which are a rehearsal of nuclear war against the DPRK.

With regard to the invitations sent by the U.S.-South Korean side to the DPRK every year to send its observers to attend these exercises, as is done in Europe, the general said that, in his opinion, "Team Spirit" and exercises conducted by NATO and Warsaw Pact Armed Forces "differ from each other considerably." In Europe, he said, "they are conducted in an atmosphere of eased tension and stronger trust and are defensive. The maneuvers conducted by the United States and South Korea are offensive and are pushing the nation into the abyss of nuclear catastrophe." "It is impossible," he said, "to hold a weapon in one hand and shake hands with your partner with the other."

North-South Dialogue Put to 'Serious Test'

PM1402142689 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Feb 89 p 3

[Own correspondent A. Platkovskiy article under the rubric "Our Commentary": "Test of Strength: Dialogue Between DPRK and South Korea Now in a Critical Situation"]

[Text] Pyongyang—The dialogue was subjected to a serious test in the course of the preliminary meeting to prepare for military-political talks at prime ministerial level. The first round of this meeting took place this week in Panmunjom—a point on the military demarcation line.

Meeting at the conference table, the delegations from the North and South sides were to set in motion the discussion on questions of reducing military-political tension on the peninsula. The DPRK delegation put forward as the main condition for continuing these talks the ending of the joint American-South Korean military maneuvers, Team Spirit-89, proposing a compromise option to the South Korean side: Abandon the involvement of foreign troops in the maneuvers, reduce their scale, and change their name. The South's delegation refused to discuss the question. The first round of the preparatory meeting therefore ended without result.

The situation took a dramatic turn when the North Korean side soon declared its decision to break off another channel of dialogue—the talks on preparations for an interparliamentary conference between North and South. These talks have been under way since last August, and the eighth round was planned for 10 February. The reason for the North Korean side's decision is again the Team Spirit maneuvers.

Of course, it is reasonable to wonder how sincere the South side is in its dialogue with the DPRK. But I believe there is also every reason to look at the position of a third party that does not take part in the talks, but plays a decisive role in the situation on the peninsula. This is the United States, whose military presence, including its nuclear presence, is the main source of tension, and whose troops, numbering some 60,000, take part in the joint Team Spirit maneuvers. Washington has

yet to respond to Pyongyang's appeal to begin talks on withdrawing its troops from South Korea and concluding a peace treaty with the DPRK.

Are any changes in Washington's position possible? Views differ. For instance, Gerald Segal of the London Institute of International Relations, writing in the INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE on Asian problems, suggested that "the intensifying criticism of the American presence in South Korea, and the calls in Washington to reduce the military budget, make the possibility of the withdrawal of U.S. troops from the Korean peninsula increasingly likely."

The future of the dialogue between the DPRK and South Korea will certainly depend on the sincerity of the participants and their readiness to compromise. But the normalization of the general atmosphere in the world, the desire to resolve problems in the spirit of relaxation of tension, and the renunciation of strong-arm policies will make it possible to put the dialogue on a firm footing.

Speech by Japan's Takeshita Views Soviet Ties

PM1602101389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Feb 89 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "In His Former Key; Japanese Prime Minister Has Delivered Policy Speech in Parliament"]

[Text] Tokyo, 10 Feb—Japan will strive to expand and deepen dialogue with the Soviet Union, including at the level of the two countries' top leaders, agreement on a meeting between whom was reached during the talks between the foreign ministers in December last year, Japanese Prime Minister N. Takeshita has stated. At the routine parliament session which resumed today after the winter vacation, he delivered a policy speech setting forth the main avenues of his cabinet's foreign and domestic policy.

N. Takeshita noted that at the two last meetings of the USSR and Japanese foreign ministers, there was a frank exchange of opinions on the entire spectrum of bilateral relations and on the most important world problems. Tokyo, he said, consistently advocates establishing relations of genuine mutual understanding with the Soviet Union and signing a peace treaty. At the same time Takeshita has again stated that this can be achieved only after satisfying Japan's demands for the "return" of the so-called "Northern territories." "We hope," he said, "that the Soviet leadership's new thinking will also be reflected in the USSR's policy toward Japan." But Takeshita himself made it clear that he does not intend to make amendments to his government's course on this issue.

Touching on the world situation, the prime minister said that "signs of progress have appeared in Soviet-U.S. dialogue, the normalization of Soviet-U.S. relations has begun, and a number of specific steps have been taken to settle regional conflicts." But, he noted, "these processes are only at the very first stage and give no grounds for excessive optimism." That is why, N. Takeshita asserted, Japan should seek to elaborate a political course which would promote the further development and consolidation of positive trends in the world.

Relations with the United States remain the cornerstone of Tokyo's foreign policy, the prime minister stressed. The prime minister expressed himself in favor of the cohesion of the Western camp, calling this one of the most important factors "of the development of relations between East and West in a more favorable direction."

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Observers Preview Jakarta Meeting on Cambodia

Opposition Demands Viewed

LD1402212989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1217 GMT 14 Feb 89

[Text] Moscow, 14 Feb (TASS)—TASS political observer Sergey Afonin writes:

On the eve of the second Jakarta meeting on Cambodia, the Khmer opposition is trying to seize the initiative and is putting forward a number of excessive demands.

The opposition is still insisting on an accelerated withdrawal of the Vietnamese troops, even though the matter is already clear. After all, the People's Republic of Kampuchea and the SRV Governments have stated that precisely for the purposes of speeding up the solution of the Cambodian problem they agreed to implement the complete withdrawal of Vietnamese volunteers from Cambodia no later that September of this year if a political settlement is reached. It is intended here that the troop withdrawal will be accompanied by a cease-fire, a commitment by foreign states not to grant military aid and access to their territory to all opposing parties in Cambodia, and an end to interference in Cambodia's internal affairs.

The PRK and SRV Governments note that the agreement on a political settlement must be implemented under effective international supervision.

This is the first and most desirable way of settlement, but other possible variants also exist, SRV Foreign Minister Nguyen Co Thach believes, for instance. A second variant is to first reach a settlement on the external aspects of the Cambodian problem. Finally, the third variant: If a political solution is not achieved, the Vietnamese troops will be completely withdrawn from Cambodia by the end of 1990.

The Khmer opposition group and the press of a number of countries are now raising a hue and cry about the importance of setting up a quadripartite coalition government headed by Prince N. Sihanouk. It is necessary to

recall the PRK's well-known position here, which is as follows: No one is entitled to impose a government on the Cambodian people without holding free general elections, organized under international supervision. The realization of the accords between the various Cambodian parties and the holding of elections could be taken on by the Council of National Reconciliation, which could be formed with N. Sihanouk at its head.

Following its policy, the opposition also demands that the PRK be abolished. Just like that; with a stroke of the pen they want to eliminate the vital gains of the Cambodian people who have their own state and lawful government. In doing so the opposition expressed its readiness to abolish the so-called Democratic Kampuchea, but are these really comparable concepts?

Prince N. Sihanouk has just stated that he has decided "to take upon himself again without delay the functions of president of the coalition government of democratic Kampuchea." Such is this "state" and "government," where everything is decided by one person or a narrow group of persons, who are in opposition to the genuine representative of the Cambodian people, which the PRK is.

The structure of the PRK must operate right up to the general elections; this idea was expressed, for instance, in the final document of the recent international conference of Cambodia in Australia. The PRK Government stresses that the right to self-determination is a sacred and inalienable right of the Cambodian people. This right can be exercised by the people alone, through free general elections with a view to determining the political, economic, and social system which would meet their national traditions and aspirations. As this happens, it is fundamentally important not to permit a recurrence of the policies and practice of the Pol Pot period in Cambodia in any form.

The process of the political settlement of the Cambodian problem is complicated and contradictory. This is inevitable, but the search for it must be conducted by first of all taking into account realities.

PRC Stance 'Constructive'

OW1502042389 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0300 GMT 14 Feb 89

[Fedorov commentary]

[Text] Listeners, the second regional conference on the Cambodian issue is scheduled to open in Jakarta on 19 February. Let use hear a commentary by station observer Fedorov in this regard.

It is predicted that the second meeting, like the first held in Bogor in Indonesia last summer, will be widely representative. Besides representatives from the four sides of the Khmer, also attending will be foreign ministers from Vietnam, Laos, and the six ASEAN nations. The meeting will open on 19 February. Diplomatic and organizational activities for the conference are already under way.

It is reported that, prior to the meeting, foreign ministers of the six ASEAN nations will hold their own meeting in Brunei, at which the Thai foreign minister will report to the participants on the results of his talks with the Chinese on the Cambodian issue while he was in Beijing.

I think the Chinese leaders' position is an important, constructive factor in clearing the way for a settlement of the Cambodian issue. According to a recent statement jointly issued by the Soviet and Chinese foreign ministers, China wants to reduce or even completely end all military aid to the various rival Khmer factions. In view of the Vietnamese decision to complete its military withdrawal from Cambodia by next September, China's position is, in fact, a guarantee for preventing a civil war in Cambodia after the Vietnamese withdrawal. I think the joint statement also reflects a very important idea, which is that both the Soviet Union and China want to prevent the policy pursued in Cambodia in the past from staging a comeback. What I have referred to here is the serious threat of the restoration of the Pol Pot genocidal regime in Cambodia.

On the eve of the Jakarta conference, China once again reiterated its position and made it more specific. Prince Sihanouk, another Khmer factional leader not in power, stated in Beijing on 13 February that China will never permit the Khmer Rouge to seize political power in Cambodia. Sihanouk also stated that the Chinese side has pointed out that the Pol Pot clique should not be included in a future coalition government of Cambodia.

Vietnamese Foreign Minister Nguyen Co Thach, who is not attending the Jakarta conference, also explained his position. He thinks the recent diplomatic activities centering on the Cambodian issue have made it possible for a quick solution to the problem. The Vietnamese foreign minister also clearly answered a question often asked by ASEAN figures, which is: After the Cambodian issues are settled, what role will Vietnam play in Southeast Asia? Foreign Minister Nguyen Co Thach answered: Vietnam will cooperate with other Southeast Asian nations to maintain security and stability in this region.

Thai Talks With Hun Sen Termed 'Courageous'

BK1502071389 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1230 GMT 14 Feb 89

[Station observer Oleg Alekseyev commentary]

[Text] PRK Council of Ministers Chairman Comrade Hun Sen's visit to Bangkok and his talks with Thai leaders stirred up a storm of negative reactions and madness in certain Thai political circles. This was manifested through a number of articles published in Thai

newspapers in recent days. The authors made assertions such as the dialogue held with Comrade Hun Sen were against Thailand's national interest. Our observer Oleg Alekseyev writes of Comrade Hun Sen's visit to Bangkok in late January:

It was an impressively unusual event because of the nonexistence of relations between Thailand and the PRK. For many years, Bangkok ignored and did not want to hear about the possibility of establishing direct bilateral relations with Phnom Penh. By all means, the courageous decision by the Thai leadership to meet and hold talks with PRK leader Comrade Hun Sen deserves the greatest respect. The move undoubtedly demonstrates that Bangkok's latest attitude toward the situation in Cambodia is a realistic and winning policy. The obvious attempt by certain Thai circles in questioning the legitimacy of the direct talks with the PRK leader was vigorously counterattacked by Kraisak Chunhawan—adviser to the Thai prime minister—through his recent articles published in the Thai newspaper THE NATION. The adviser outlined that the government's initiative was taken with the aim of removing stumbling blocks in the way leading toward national reconciliation in Cambodia. The direct talks with Comrade Hun Sen were a straightforward move and in the right direction. The move was in close link with the significant events promoting the settlement of the Cambodian problem, such as the meeting between the Vietnamese and Chinese parties and the successful talks between the Soviet side and his Chinese counterpart. The attacks launched by those who have been opposing the dialogue with Phnom Penh are currently shared by members of the Thai opposition parties as well.

According to various press agencies, in a statement at a news conference, prominent Thai politician Bunchu Rotchanasathian—leader of the Community Action party—paid high esteem for Prime Minister ChatChai Chunhawan's initiative in inviting Comrade Hun Sen to come to Bangkok. The opposition leader's statement has been considered by many Thai broadcast services as a demonstration of the increasingly amalgamated political forces in the country around the government's new policy with regard to the Cambodian problem. Thai newspapers have noted that the direct talks with Phnom Penh were for the sake of regional peace or, in other words, in agreement with Thailand's national interest, and also brought about the country's unity.

Thai Businessmen Urge Ties With Indochina

PM1502151189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Feb 89 Second Edition p 5

[Report by PRAVDA own correspondent V. Skvortsov: "A View of the Future"]

[Text] Bangkok, 13 Feb—The prospects of a Cambodian settlement and of better relations with the countries of Indochina have attracted extensive comment and have given rise to lively debate and an exchange of opinions among the broadest political, business, and public circles in Thailand. For all their contradictoriness, the views do have something in common—these relations must be developed without delay and without giving way to the ingrained fear of "communist penetration." It is worth noting that the most active stance is adopted by representatives of very influential business circles in the country.

"For a long time now I have been advocating the widening and development of trade and economic relations with neighboring countries—Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia," Bunchu Rochanasatiyen [name as published], a prominent financier, well known at home for his fresh and unusual approaches to the solution of Thailand's domestic and foreign policy problems," told me. He welcomed the initiatives by Chatchai Chunhawan's government geared to developing direct contacts with Hanoi, Vientiane, and Phnom Penh.

Responding to critics of the new government course of developing relations with neighbors, Rochanasatiyen called the course realistic. He welcomed the recent meeting between the country's prime minister and Cambodian Prime Minister Hun Sen as the correct and right thing to do.

Philippines' Laurel Calls for Bases Closure

LD1402122689 Moscow TASS in English 1159 GMT 14 Feb 89

[Text] Manila February 14 TASS—Salvador Laurel, vice-president of the Philippines, has called for gradually dismantling U.S. war bases in the territory of his country within the next ten years. Addressing officials of the Foreign Ministry here this Monday, he said that a decision on U.S. bases should be taken already now so as to start talks on an agreement to liquidate gradually all American military instalations in the Philippines. The vice- president believes that during the Washington talks the Filipino side should not agree to terms inferior to those offered to other states hosting U.S. war bases. Furthermore, "a period must be fixed, not exceeding ten years, within which these bases should be closed down," Laurel said.

Philippines Senator Warns of Honasan Plans

LD1402131788 Moscow TASS in English 1304 GMT 14 Feb 89

[Text] Manila February 14 TASS—Supporters of the former Philippine President Ferdinand Marcos and the head of the unsuccessful military putsch in August 1987, Colonel Honasan, are planning acts of terrorism to destabilise Corazon Aquino's government, Philippine Senator Ernesto Maceda said on Monday. He also said that these two groups are closely connected.

Maceda, who is also head of the Senate Commission on National Defence and Security, made this statement to clarify earlier reports about the plans of Marcos supporters and the rebellious Colonel Honasan to stage a military coup d'etat to overthrow the present Philippine Government, the press reported.

Commentary Views Marcos Request for Return
HK1602031789 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Commentary by correspondent Anatoliy Aleksandrov]

[Text] The Philippine Government filed charges against former President Ferdinand Marcos way back in July 1987. However, to this date the $10 billion stolen by the former president during his 20-year reign has not been returned. What remains of his rule are powerful accusations about his role in looting the national treasury, his greed, killings, intimidations, and other forms of graft and corruption which brought harsh difficulties to the Filipino nation. No computer can calculate the enormous wealth illegally accumulated by the former president. This was the declaration of the Philippines' number one public prosecutor, Francisco Chavez.

However, despite these accusations, talks abound about the possible return of Marcos to the Philippines. The former dictator is presently lying seriously ill in a hospital in Honolulu and has expressed his desire to die in his own country.

Nevertheless, he has at the same time rejected accusations against him and denied accumulating wealth illegally. It was true that the country suffered greatly under his regime, piling up debts amounting to $29 billion, but these were believable. Opponents of the former president are allegedly fabricating these baseless stories, blaming him for lawlessness and violence, and accusing him of taking bribes from Japanese companies. For each contract on construction of roads and bridges, Marcos reportedly received a 10- to 15- percent commission, said one of his former government ministers. He amassed some $4.5 million, which was then deposited in Swiss banks.

Even in the United States, the former president and his wife face racketeering charges. They were said to have smuggled about $100 million from the Philippines, depositing a large portion in the United States. Thus, the Philippine judicial system was not the only one challenged by the Marcos couple.

Due to his ill health, Ferdinand Marcos could not face a court arraignment. But no one is withdrawing charges against him.

How then is the question of Marcos returning to the Philippines to be resolved? Generally speaking, a majority of the Filipino people do not want to see the exdictator again. As reported in the newspapers, House of Representatives Speaker Ramon Mitra said that whatever happens, the legislators in both the upper and lower houses do not want Marcos to return to the country.

Meanwhile, supporters of the former president held a demonstration in front of the U.S. Embassy a few days ago, demanding that the former president be returned from exile. In their appeal to President Aquino, they called on her to be compassionate. However, after weighing the pros and cons, President Aquino announced that any government decision was made in the interest of the Filipino people.

Radio Acknowledges Listener's Letter
HK1502033189 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 14 Feb 89

[Text] Before we continue with our program, we would like to greet Alexander Esteva of Cagayan de Oro City. He is the first listener to respond to Radio Moscow's broadcasts in the Filipino language. He is the very first one to write to us. As a sign of our appreciation, we are sending him a souvenir album about life in the Soviet Union. Along with this, we are sending a schedule giving the frequency levels and hours of broadcast of our Tagalog program.

In reply to Alexander's questions, we wish to tell him that Radio Moscow began broadcasting in Tagalog quite recently—on 1 January this year. The broadcasters you hear are Filipinos, however this does not mean that no one else speaks Tagalog in the Soviet Union. All those who tune in to us regularly can find out who the broadcasters are, when they are on the air, and how they are studying the Filipino language, as well as where they study, who is teaching and who the students are that are learning the language.

We will also give you, during our broadcasts, information about Soviet-Filipino cooperation in the fields of tourism, culture and sports, as well as on relations between our two governments.

To all those who are our new listeners, please be assured that Radio Moscow is always happy to receive your letters. Your questions and requests can make our broadcasts more diverse and interesting. Because we have just started these broadcasts, those who write to us can have the chance to provide suggestions and contribute to our program. We will give souvenirs to all those who write us. So we await your letters, dear friends.

Near East & South Asia

Shevardnadze Outlines Goals of Mideast Trip
LD1602100189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Feb 89 Second Edition p 4

[Interview with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by TASS diplomatic correspondent Vadim Biryukov on 15 February entitled: "Forthcoming Official Visit. USSR Foreign Minister Shevardnadze Answers TASS Diplomatic Correspondent's Question"; place of interview not given]

[Text] Question. It has been announced that you are to pay an official visit to a number of Near and Middle

Eastern countries. What are the aims of the visit and what results do you hope to achieve?

Answer. You can form a general impression about the course of our thinking in preparing for the tour by attentively studying Mikhail Gorbachev's address to the United Nations on December 7, 1988. The principles of our vision of the world, set forth in the address, apply also to the Near and Middle East.

Our diplomatic baggage, to be taken on the trip, will contain some essentially new ideas intended for the near and more remote perspective.

We proceed from the fact that the Soviet Union, inseparably connected with that region geographically, historically, and politically, should and can make its contribution to settling drawn-out and extremely painful conflicts and to establishing a lasting peace for the benefit of the peoples in the Near and Middle East.

Of course, the nature of these conflicts is such that no dramatic effects can be expected in the course of the ten-day visit.

But, nonetheless, we are convinced that it is time for more vigorous actions.

Due attention will be given, naturally, to the further development of our bilateral relations with Syria, Jordan, Egypt, Iraq and Iran.

Afghan Government Statement Warns Pakistan

LD1502193189 Moscow TASS in English 1923 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Text] Kabul February 15 TASS—The following statement by the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan was circulated here on Wednesday.

"The last serviceman from the limited contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan stepped on Soviet soil today. The commitments on the withdrawal of foreign troops within the agreed upon period were fully met within the context of a comprehensive political settlement and in accordance with the Geneva accords.

"This important event calls for a thorough and responsible assessment of the development of the situation inside and outside Afghanistan over the past nine years, analysis of the internationally recognized pledges of the countries which signed the Geneva agreements.

"In pursuing a policy of national reconciliation and fully realizing the vital need for the earliest peace settlement, the Republic of Afghanistan is applying maximum effort to achieve the successful completion of the Geneva process and remove all external aspects of the Afghan conflict.

"The signing of the Geneva agreements became possible only when the Afghan Government, on the one hand, created favourable conditions for the Soviet troops' withdrawal, and all the parties concerned, on the other hand, realised the need for an interrelated approach to the solution of external aspects of the Afghan problem.

"This made up the logical basis for the Geneva agreements. The letter and spirit of Geneva were directed at putting an end to growing outside interference in the internal Afghan conflict and at paving the way for normalised relations between Afghanistan and Pakistan with a view to defusing the domestic crisis in Afghanistan and strengthening peace and security in the region.

"The basic principles of interrelationship between the obligations and the need to abide by them were grossly breached, however. At a time when the Afghan and Soviet sides applied maximum effort towards strict compliance with their pledges, Pakistan and the United States did not conceal their intentions to reduce the essence of the Geneva agreements exclusively to the withdrawal of Soviet troops, totally ignoring their commitments on non-interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs.

"To the same extent that the observance of the Geneva agreements by the Soviet Union and Afghanistan enhanced the authority of the United Nations, their violation by the United States and Pakistan undermined the prestige of this international organisation. This clearly reveals Pakistan's and the United States' disregard for international law.

"Armed interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs, both in qualitative and quantitative respects, enhanced several times over against the nine-month period preceding the signing of the Geneva agreements.

"Camps on Pakistani territory where extremist groups undergo military training have stepped up their activity. Depots of weapons and munitions, printing facilities, radio stations, headquarters and other institutions of opposition Afghan groups are situated there as well.

"Pakistan's recent decision to take a direct part in the conflict by sending its armed forces to fight on the side of Afghan opposition groups substantially worsened the situation.

"According to information received from knowledgeable sources, more than 4,600 instances of Pakistani violations of the Geneva agreements have been registered as of today. 1,800 of that total were brought to the notice of the UN Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP) for subsequent investigation.

"Regrettably, the United States not only ignored its commitments as a guarantor of the Geneva agreements, but also kindled the conflict by sending large batches of modern weaponry to Afghan opposition units.

"In addition to that, UNGOMAP's efforts to monitor compliance with the Geneva agreements turned to be virtually fruitless due to obstacles artificially created by Pakistan.

"The United States and Pakistan, having trampled upon the Geneva agreements, damaged our efforts directed towards terminating the conflict and achieving accord among the Afghans.

"Pakistan undertook attempts to unite various Afghan opposition groups into a so-called shura (consultative board) and a transitional government on its territory and exerted, with this aim in view, immense effort on them.

"Using that 'government', some Pakistani leaders would like to carry out their plan of annexing Afghanistan under the guise of the 'Afghan-Pakistani confederation.'

"These hostile expansionist plans directed against Afghanistan's independence are resolutely rejected and denounced by the people and the Government of Afghanistan.

[Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 16 February 1989 in its Second Edition on page 4 adds the following: "Any decision by this 'shura,' which does not represent all the real political forces inside and outside Afghanistan, will have no effect other than to increase hostility and further complicate the political settlement of the situation in Afghanistan, and therefore will have no legal force for the Afghan people and government."]

"There are no doubts whatsoever that the Afghan Government's position on that issue enjoys full support of Afghanistan's friends.

"Considering the current situation, Afghanistan and the Soviet Union had all the rights to suspend the withdrawal of a part of the Soviet troops. It was decided, however, to continue their pullout in keeping with the schedule in order to demonstrate the two countries' adherence to the Geneva agreements and impel the other side to abide by its treaty obligations.

"Now that there are no Soviet troops in Afghanistan, the Afghan Government calls for a responsible and sober analysis of the situation and the grave consequences that will inevitably emerge due to serious violations of the Geneva agreements by Pakistan and the United States.

"It declares that should interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs continue, all responsibility for its dangerous consequences will fully rest with the Pakistani side.

"All those who think that upon the Soviet troop withdrawal they will be free to do anything and intend to mount aggression against Afghanistan should know that the Afghan Government reserves the right to undertake any necessary defensive measures in keeping with the UN Charter and the bilateral Afghan-Soviet treaty.

"The people and Government of Afghanistan expect that the UN secretary-general, being the depository of the Geneva agreements, will effectively fulfill in an all-round way his committments on the basis of the relevant resolution of the 43rd General Assembly session and use the powers vested in him so that the other side also abide by the Geneva agreements.

"Now that the Soviet troops have left Afghan territory, the Afghan Government expresses on behalf of the entire Afghan population the sincere gratitude to the people and Government of the USSR for their all-round assistance and solidarity with the struggle for national sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of our motherland.

"It is convinced that relations between the two states will continue to develop on principles of friendship, good-neighbourhood, mutual benefit and non-interference in each other's internal affairs in keeping with the bilateral treaties and agreements in the interests of the peoples of the two countries, for the benefit of peace, stability and cooperation in the region and throughout the world.

"The Afghan Government declares that the Afghan people are prepared to stand up resolutely against all forms of foreign intervention and thwart sinister designs and intrigues of the enemies of their country."

Party-Government Appeal to Returning Veterans

PM1602091589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Feb 89 Second Edition p 1

["CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers Appeal to Soviet Servicemen Returning From Afghanistan"]

[Text] Dear Comrades!

The Central Committee of the CPSU, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the USSR Council of Ministers cordially greet you, the worthy sons of the socialist motherland. You have returned to the motherland having honorably and courageously fulfilled your patriotic and international duty. At the request of the lawful government, you defended the people of Afghanistan, children, old men and women, peaceful village and towns, and the national independence and sovereignty of a friendly country.

Through their military tasks servicemen of all branches of the service have won the deep respect of the Soviet people and the sincere recognition and gratitude of the Afghan people. Doctors, nurses, and other specialists showed great steadfastness and charity. In the days of the harsh trials of battle, you learned to value even more military brotherhood, to prize the motherland and the revolutionary and fighting traditions of Soviet people.

The homeland warmly and cordially welcomes you its dear sons, and pays tribute to the memory of those who fell and grieves together with their loved ones, families, and friends. The exploits and names of your comrades-in-arms shall forever remain in the memory of the Soviet people. It is our sacred duty to give unceasing care and attention to the families of the dead, the disabled, and the wounded. The bonds of battlefield fraternity and comradeship oblige you, too, to be always alongside them.

We express heartfelt thanks to you for your honest and selfless fulfillment of your duties on Afghan soil and for your high patriotism and internationalism. We are convinced that the political and military tempering you have undergone will assist you in worthy fulfillment of your military and civic duties, in taking an active position in life, and in making a weighty contribution to the cause of restructuring, revolutionary renewal of Soviet society, and the military-patriotic education of young people.

Dear comrades, we wish you good health, happiness, new successes, and splendid accomplishments!

Your homeland is proud of you!
Your homeland thanks you!
Your homeland is counting on you!

The CPSU Central Committee
The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
The USSR Council of Ministers

Gromov Speaks After Completion of Afghan Pullout

Thanks CPSU, Government

LD1502234189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Text] A meeting has taken place in the border town of Termez. Speaking there, Hero of the Soviet Union Lieutenant General Gromov said in particular:

[Begin Gromov recording] Having completed our internationalist duty on the territory of the Republic of Afghanistan, I wish to express sincere filial gratitude on behalf of the entire personnel of the limited contingent of Soviet troops to the CPSU Central Committee, the Politburo, the Soviet Government, and the entire Soviet people for their constant attention and support for the internationalist soldiers, and for the high assessment of our military work given at the 27th CPSU Congress and the 10th CPSU Party Conference.

Permit me also to express sincere gratitude to the leadership of Syrkhardarya Oblast and the inhabitants of the town of Termez for their warm reception and meeting. All this will remain in our hearts for many years.

The love and care of the Soviet people oblige us to work harder in strengthening the USSR's defense capability. We will continue to do everything to turn the ideas of restructuring into real practical deeds in resolving the problems of raising the USSR Armed forces to a higher qualitative level. [end recording]

Mourns Fallen Soviet Soldiers

PM1602140189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Feb 89 First Edition p 1

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA special correspondent Lieutenant Colonel A. Oliynik report: "The Fatherland Greets Its Sons"]

[Excerpts] The inhabitants of the two border towns—Termez and Kushka—relatives and friends of the soldiers coming from many corners of our country, and representatives of the public and local garrisons gathered yesterday for ceremonial rallies to mark our troops' return from Afghanistan.

It was 1130 hours in Termez. A reddish cloud of dust shrouding the Afghan port of Hayraton could be seen from the high bank of the Amu Darya. The growing roar of combat vehicles reached us from there. Our last troop convoy was coming, bedecked with red calico banners and flags. "We won't forget you, Afghanistan! Peace be with you and tranquility!"—that was the inscription written in Russian and Dari on the side of one armored personnel carrier. [passage omitted]

...The formation stood to attention on the bank of the Amu Darya. The Soviet national anthem could be heard. The ceremonial rally began. It was attended by S. Mamarasulov, first secretary of the Surkhandarya party obkom; V.P. Anishev, second secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee; Army General N.I. Popov; G.A. Stefanovskiy, deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; military chiefs; veterans of the Great Patriotic War; Soviet and foreign journalists; and representatives of the public.

Lieutenant General Gromov was at the microphone.

"We did our duty with honor," he said. "This unforgettable meeting on our native soil is the result of our acknowledgment of the selfless courage of the Soviet Army's soldiers, sergeants, warrant officers, officers, and civilian employees... But not everyone has come home alive. I ask you to honor their memory with a minute's silence."

Silence. We bowed our heads to the glorious memory of the dead, to all those whose names figure on the sorrowful list of losses in Afghanistan.

This silence will impress itself on our lives for a long time to come. May our sighs of relief on our return and the coming daily cares not push internationalist soldiers' problems into the background. We are answerable for their future.

Politicians and military historians must still thoroughly analyze the results of the time spent by the limited contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan. I would hope that everything said about Afghan events will be said openly, and that an assessment will be made of everyone who worked there during these 9 years—party, economic, and military advisers, numerous specialists, medics, teachers, geologists, and construction workers... The extent of our soldiers' exploits is well known: They generously sprinkled blood and sweat on Afghan soil. They fulfilled their motherland's commands. All the well known textbook exploits of the Great Patriotic War were repeated by our young contemporaries on Afghan soil.

Feats of arms were performed by people who grew up not knowing war. They were the combatant children of noncombatant fathers... They have once again shown the entire world the valor, courage, and lofty combat and moral qualities of Soviet people.

Every internationalist soldier probably has his own memories of Afghanistan. There are the words spoken to the people, whose freedom and independence they were defending. There is still no peace in this long-suffering land. But we would like to see a real life revive in the villages and cities, a life worthy of this proud and hard-working people, and to ensure that everyone who values his home does not forget the Soviet soldier. He wished them peace and happiness always. He has done everything in his power to ensure this.

...The rally ended. Subunits from the former limited contingent of troops marched past the rostrum.

Flowers flew once again. No, one cannot forget this day—15 February 1989.

Comments to Moscow TV

LD1502231589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 15 Feb 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Commentator Vladimir Molchanov] Good evening. Today is a special day, both joyful and sad. Joyful because the last Soviet soldier has left the territory of Afghanistan, and there will be no more news of new casualties, no more funerals from the foreign soil where our compatriots have perished. But the pain and grief of the losses we have sustained in Afghanistan for some 9 years will always be with us. The war invalids, who need our aid and concern, will always be alongside us." We are also obliged to remember that.

Today we know that we lost over 14,000 of our servicemen on that soil, and we are obliged to make public everything connected with Afghanistan and with those December days in 1979 when our troops entered that country's territory. We must know whether the leadership of the Soviet Union at that time acted correctly.

The last Soviet soldier crossed the Soviet-Afghan frontier at 0955 Moscow time. He is the son of a Red Army soldier who perished at the front in the Great Patriotic War, a man who lost his wife in an airplane disaster 3 years ago and today is bringing up two sons. He is Lieutenant General Boris Gromov, a 45-year-old Hero of the Soviet Union. Our correspondents report on what preceded Gromov's crossing of the frontier and on what is happening now in Termez and Kushka:

[Begin recording]

[Reporter M. Leshchinskiy] This was our soldiers' last night on Afghan soil, the last one before the first day of peace for them. Wars end in different ways. This one ended like this: on the day that had been determined in advance and at the agreed spot on the Soviet frontier. This date, 15 February, was named in Geneva exactly 11 months ago. Today, the last day that has been separating all our servicemen from the motherland, has been crossed off the soldiers' calendars. Well, you can imagine what the joy of returning is like. On this day even generals who have been in combat are singing alongside artistes. [video shows soldiers pinning medals on each other, cleaning boots and vehicles, watching a concert]

That's how this war ended: in songs and serious reflection on what they went through. The most experienced and hardened servicemen were the last ones due to leave Afghanistan. Many of them should have returned home in the autumn, but stayed on in order not to risk the lives of their young comrades, so that the war should not determine the fate of those who were only about to go into the army.

Then the last commands on Afghan soil rang out, and the military column set off for the frontier. Now, everything is behind them. But the war will not end for them: While they dream at night of the faces of their comrades-in-arms, volleys of gunfire and machinegun fire roar, mines explode on the roads, and helicopters fall, enveloped in flames. Will the war really end as long as the mothers and wives of those who have perished and their orphaned children are alive, and until they are given a clear and precise answer to the question: "In the name of what?" [video shows convoy of soldiers riding on armored personnel carriers crossing a bridge]

The war will also not end for a long time yet for the army commander, Lt Gen Gromov, Hero of the Soviet Union. He has given up a total of 5 and ½ years of his life to Afghanistan, and now it is 15 February 1989. [video shows Gromov dismounting from vehicle and walking toward camera, then being interviewed by Leshchinskiy]

[Gromov] Well, what I want to say is that there is not a single Soviet soldier, officer, or warrant officer behind me, and the 9-year-old stay has ended with this. I also want to say that, well, monuments must be put up to our soldiers who have been through these 9 years.

[Leshchinskiy, shaking hands with Gromov] Well, a happy future, in peaceful conditions, and may neither you nor a single serviceman of ours cross the frontier between war and peace any more. Well, now here's your son to meet you. [video shows Gromov and son embracing] And thousands of people are now waiting for our servicemen in Termez. [end recording]

Soldiers Shown Returning From Afghanistan

Pullout Called Sign of 'Realism'

LD1502182589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 15 Feb 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report from Termez over video by correspondent M. Ganiyev]

[Text] The bread and salt of the native long-awaited land; valuable gifts from the command; a many-thousand-strong festive meeting; words of gratitude from the platform; thousands of bouquets of flowers. Of course they have earned this. [video shows two girls in national costume presenting Gromov with traditional bread and salt, soldiers in the background, close-up of waving relatives, and a top military official among the formation of soldiers handing out small gifts]

On the chests of many I see combat decorations and medals. Yes, they risked their lives; they went through the fiery paths of war and honestly fulfilled their military duty. [video shows a soldier hugging a woman, relatives mingling with the soldiers, close-up of a soldier's medals on his chest]

[Begin recording] [G.A. Stefanovskiy, deputy chief of the main political administration of the Soviet Army and Navy, speaking to Ganiyev] In my view, today is one of the most wonderful days and it will probably go down in history, on a special page in the history of the armed forces and in the history of our people, as a day that testifies to the realism of our policy of new thinking, which is being implemented along all channels, including in the resolving of such an important question as the Afghan question. [end recording] [video shows band playing, soldiers marching by, waving relatives on one side, close-up of relaxed uniformed soldiers waving carnations]

The first festive march on native soil, after the Afghan roads; a half-hour stop in order to embrace those nearest and dearest who have come to the meeting; and one more, on the vehicles. The soldiers transferred to the reserve will disperse directly from here to their homes, while the remainder will continue their service. Their road lies into the depths of the country to the place of permanent stationing. [video shows soldiers on the move again in their vehicles, a cameraman filming]

In a word, the military assistance and the actions of our Soviet units and subunits in Afghanistan are completed.

Welcomed by Public in Kushka

LD1502212789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 15 Feb 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by correspondent K. Babayev]

[Text] [video shows snow-covered terrain, road barrier in the foreground, and possible outlines of a bridge in the distance through snow falling quite heavily, as well as soldier on guard duty at the barrier]

According to a popular saying, snow for a Turkmen is always a good thing. Much of it has fallen on the most southerly town in the USSR, and so at 0810 Moscow time the first combat vehicles, the very last columns now, were plowing though the snowy virgin land beyond the bridge across the small river of Kushkinka. [video shows hillside with large lettering "USSR" on it; jeeps at the base of the hill; column of men on vehicles driving through the snow, two women waving at the side; view of cross-shaped monument]

This stone monument, erected back in 1913, is visible from all parts of Kushka. I happened to hear a phrase today spoken by one of the boys: Here's a cross for the war, for a war which lasted twice as long the Great Patriotic War. An orchestra will not be playing a victory march today, but its sounds are announcing a victory which is perhaps more important than a military one, a victory of sensible and sober policy. [video shows soldiers and high-ranking officers in uniform standing near buildings in the driving snow, and smiling and shaking hands; army orchestra playing outdoors in the snow; and military convoy on the move]

The people of Kushka have done everything to make this day truly festive. People can phone any point in the country directly from the meeting place; or send telegrams which will bring joy to the homes of relatives, friends, and fiances. One hopes that the lads who have gone through Afghanistan will encounter such treatment in all towns and villages of our enormous motherland. [video shows hot food being ladled onto plates outdoors; women and youngsters running toward soldiers standing in a group in the snow; public mingling with soldiers]

The movement along the route along which the columns went out from the neighboring country is unending. Only peaceful freight is going along it now. [video shows a march-past by soldiers with people looking on, banners on display; another glimpse of a military column on the move]

UN Observers Confirm Completion of Pullout

LD1502164789 Moscow TASS in English 1631 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Text] Termez, southern border of USSR, February 15 TASS—The Soviet troop pullout from the Republic of Afghanistan has been completed today. The last to cross

the Soviet-Afghanistan border was General Boris Gromov, 45, who is now among the most popular generals in the Soviet forces. The commander of the limited contingent of Soviet troops walked the bridge across the Amu Darya, concluding the withdrawal of units from Afghanistan.

The last vehicle of the last Soviet military unit leaving Afghanistan crossed today the frontier post near the town of Kushka, Soviet Turkemnia. First deputy commander of the limited contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan, Major General Nikolay Pishchev rode in the vehicle. Not a single Soviet servicemen was left on the other side of the border. This was confirmed by UN observers in Afghanistan and Pakistan who arrived in Kushka with the column.

A meeting was held on a small plateau near Kushka. The participants in the meeting were saying with pride that the words of the Soviet Government are confirmed by actions, that the USSR fulfills unswe ingly its obligations under the Geneva accords.

Words of praise addressed to soldier-internationalists were said at the meeting. Each of them was presented with watches, a present from the USSR Defence Ministry. The Soviet soldiers are now at home.

UN, FRG Praise Soviet Afghanistan Withdrawal

LD1502205589 Moscow TASS in English 2044 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Text] Moscow February 15 TASS—UN Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar, his representative on a settlement of the Afghanistan situation and the United Nations Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan "wish to express their appreciation to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and to its civilian and military representatives, for the assistance and cooperation provided to the Good Offices Mission in the discharge of its mandate during the withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan". This statement was made today by the spokesman for the UN secretary-general.

The good offices mission submitted today a report to the UN secretary-general where it informed him that the withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan was completed in compliance with the Geneva accords. It expressed "particular satisfaction at the scrupulous manner in which the time-frame for the withdrawal had been observed". The UN secretary-general, his spokesman pointed out, was "gratified" with the report of the Good Offices Mission, which will be issued, under cover of a note by the secretary-general shortly.

West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl welcomed today the withdrawal of the limited contingent of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. In a statement issued in Bonn, he called on all the parties involved in the conflict to display a feeling of responsibility, a reasonable and balanced approach.

The Afghan people, the chancellor pointed out, should take the chance to determine their future and to form a representative government. At the same time Kohl assured the UN secretary-general of the support for his efforts aimed at settling the domestic Afghan conflict.

'Calm Situation' Reported in Kabul

PM1502164189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Feb 89 Morning Edition p 4

['Survey' by Yevg. Bay in Moscow and TASS correspondent Yu. Tyssovskiy in Kabul under the rubric "Panorama of International Events": "Calm Situation Maintained in Kabul"]

[Text] A calm situation is being maintained in Kabul on the last day of the Soviet troops' withdrawal from Afghanistan. Despite the shelling of the airport zone and residential districts on Tuesday, the city looks as usual under the rays of the bright winter sun: Hundreds of people are hurrying to work and the merchants are going to the market, REUTER reports.

On Tuesday evening, the agencies report, the last Soviet soldiers from the subunit guarding the airport left Kabul onboard four Il-76 aircraft.

"The regular army numbering about 30,000 men is now in the Afghan capital," the correspondent of the Japanese newspaper YOMIURI writes from Kabul. "If you take into account the militia and volunteer corps detachments, then it may be said that a reliable defense system has been created in Kabul."

REUTER reports the distribution among 400 of the city's poor families of food received through UN channels. Government troops controlling the Salang Pass, the agency reports, inform us that a large convoy with food arrived in the capital on Monday; another convoy is expected Wednesday.

"Nothing has changed here with the Soviet troops' withdrawal from Kabul," a TASS correspondent told the editorial office over the telephone. "The city is absolutely calm. Our Western colleagues who have arrived here are simply amazed. They counted on seeing panic and the mass evacuation of the population. I personally have formed the impression that many of them came here to cover not so much the withdrawal of our troops as the supposed death throes of the regime. None of this is happening. To their dismay there is almost no 'hot news.' The government and army have been left face to face with the enemy and this has led to results completely opposite of those expected. There is more restraint and more faith in their own strength."

"What is the food and fuel situation like?"

"There are no problems with flour; it is being issued to inhabitants in sufficient quantities. It is true that our military transport aircraft have temporarily suspended

flights from Tashkent. But food is being delivered to the population along the Hayraton-Kabul road. A fuel shortage is being felt, and as before there are very few vehicles on the streets."

"This week the agencies reported the expulsion of three French journalists from the country and the introduction of tough restrictions on correspondents' movements round Kabul..."

"The French reporters, despite the ban, tried to penetrate to the fighting zone to take photographs of the government army operations under fire from the rebels. This was a direct violation of the established rules. We shall recall that Kabul is in fact under siege. But we can move around the city itself without any restrictions, at least in daylight. Even the previously closed airport zone is no exception. Six Soviet journalists are continuing to work in the Afghan capital now. By day we work outside the embassy."

The consultative council, the "shura" of the armed Afghan opposition, continues in the Pakistani city of Rawalpindi, but, REUTER points out, "rival Afghan factions have still made virtually no progress in creating a provisional government in Afghanistan. The moderate parties within the 'alliance' are still threatening to boycott the talks until their differences with the fundamentalists are resolved."

Representatives of the "Alliance of Eight" operating in Iran have already boycotted the opening ceremony because of the "Seven's" refusal to give them the 100 seats they are asking for in the Consultative Council. Immediately after the official opening, as a sign of solidarity with the groupings based in Iran, the present chairman of the "Alliance of Seven," Sebghatullah Mujadeddi, left the hall with a number of his supporters. As is well known, Mujadeddi, who belongs to the relatively moderate circles of the opposition, signed an agreement in Iran 2 weeks ago with leaders of the "Eight" guaranteeing them 100 seats in the Consultative Council. But the extremist wing of the "Alliance of Seven" headed by Gulbuddin Hikmatyar refused to observe the signed agreement, which has led to the present eruption of contradictions.

"Many Afghans," the London newspaper FINANCIAL TIMES stresses in this connection, "have already lost interest in the 'shura,' which, according to one high-ranking member of a moderate party, is 'absolutely futile.'" This opinion is shared by many tribal leaders and commanders of field subunits, the newspaper notes. THE GUARDIAN points out that "some mujahidin leaders are very concerned that the mounting tension within their movement may become an open conflict."

The leaders of the Afghan opposition's United National Front, who call themselves "the representatives of the silent majority of Afghans," have sent a letter to UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar. The letter notes with great regret the predicted failure to hold the Consultative Council in Rawalpindi. The letter's authors explain this by the fact that "under an ancient and sacred tradition, neither 'shuras' nor 'jirgas' can be lawful outside Afghanistan. It is essential to hold a jirga or general assembly, which are the traditional means of overcoming a national crisis." The failure of the "shura" is also explained by "active foreign interference that is increasing the difficulties, which have already become insurmountable, on the path toward peace and stabilization within the country," the letter says.

But the following are the main reports from the flood of news. Early on the morning of 15 February, UPI flashed the news: "The Soviet Army has completed its withdrawal from Afghanistan after a 9-year war, the longest in Soviet history." REUTER: "The last Soviet soldier has left Afghanistan."

Mujahidin Continue Efforts To Form Government

'Acute Differences' Remain

LD1502224189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1607 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Text] [no dateline, as received]—The Council of Ministers of the Republic of Afghanistan has condemned the interference of Pakistan in the internal affairs of the Afghan Republic. At a regular session of the government in the Afghan capital on Tuesday, the participants described the intention of some Pakistani leaders to create a so-called "Afghan-Pakistani confederation" as a crude violation of the norms of international law and an encroachment on the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence of Afghanistan.

Over the past 24 hours, opposition groups have heavily shelled a number of populated areas in the provinces of Nangarhar and Paktia, the town of Khowst, the suburbs of Herat, security posts in the provinces of Kabul and Parvan, and Qandahar airport. Some Afghan Army soldiers have been wounded.

Afghan artillery has struck enemy concentration points in Nangarhar Province; 32 extremists were killed and a number of weapons and ammunition dumps seized. Rebels from the "Islamic Society of Afghanistan" group lost 18 men in the provinces of Kabul and Parvan. As a result of government operations, 11 rebels were killed and 8 wounded in Herat Province.

The Afghan Foreign Ministry has sent its 218th note to the UN Good Offices Mission in Kabul, which cites facts of a new violation by Islamabad of the provisions of the Geneva agreements.

Political observers have described the state of affairs in the lair of the Afghan opposition—who have gathered at a consultative council (shura) in the Pakistani town of Rawalpindi—as deadlocked. Despite the official announcement of the opening of the shura and the

sessions that have been going on for 2 days, acute differences still remain between the various opposition groups. In fact, it is only the representatives of certain groups and parties who comprise the "Alliance of Seven," based in Pakistan, who are present at the council's sessions. The "Alliance of Eight," which is based in Iran, continues to boycott the shura, accusing the "Seven" of failing to observe the treaty by granting them 100 seats in the Consultative Council. The present leader of the "Alliance of Seven," Sebgatullah Mujadeddi—who insists on the Iranian "Alliance's" participation in the council's work—has also spoken about continuing to boycott the shura. His position is supported by a number of moderate group leaders within the "Seven," who accuse the extremist wing of the alliance, headed by Gulbuddin Hikmatyar, of trying to dictate its own conditions to them.

As an opposition spokesman has reported, the debates today were held mainly within the framework of the hurriedly created commission for the reconciliation of the two "alliances." However, no progress was achieved on this question. "Ali Reza Mo'ayeri, the Iranian deputy prime minister for political affairs, who has arrived in Pakistan on a special trip, is taking part in the attempts to overcome the differences.

The representatives of the Afghan opposition based in Pakistan today handed a draft of a so-called "transition government" of 28 members to their own delegates in the Consultative Council of the "irreconcilables" (shura). As Abdul Rasul Sayyaf, the official spokesman of the "shura," whose sessions in Rawalpindi are being held amid the most acute differences, stated at a press conference, Ahmad Shah may become the head of this government. The names of the members of the cabinet of ministers should be announced as soon as the "transition government" receives a vote of confidence.

According to Sayyaf, the opposition groups based in Iran, who are categorically boycotting the shura, may also be offered a number of posts in the "transition government."

'Stalemate' in Talks

LD1502160389 Moscow TASS in English 1531 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Text] Islamabad February 15 TASS—Political news analysts described the state of matters in the camp of the Afghan opposition, which assembled for a Consultative Council (shura) meeting in the Pakistani city of Rawalpindi, as a stalemate. Despite the official announcement about the shura opening and its meetings that went into their second already, [as received] sharp differences between various groups remain.

Only representatives of several groups and parties forming the Pakistan-based Alliance of the Seven actually attended the council meetings. The Iran-based Eight-Party Alliance continues to boycott the shura, accusing the seven of non-compliance with the understanding regarding the provision of the hundred seats in the Consultative Council.

Sebghatullah Mujaddedi, the current chairman of the Alliance of the Seven who insists on the Iran-based alliance's participation in the Council work, stated about [as received] the continued boycott of the shura. His stance is supported by several leaders of the Alliance of the Seven moderate groups, who accuse the alliance's extremist wing led by Gulbuddin Hikmatyar of the bid to dictate their terms to them.

According to an opposition spokesman, debates were held on Wednesday basically within the framework of the hastily convened commission on the two alliances' reconciliation. No progress was, however, reached on this issue. Ali Reza Mo'ayeri, Iranian deputy prime minister for political affairs, arrived in Pakistan specially to try to bridge differences.

Pakistan Escalating Moves Against Afghan Regime

PM1502151789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Feb 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Yevg. Bay article: "Irrefutable Facts: Pakistan Is Continuing To Escalate Its Military Actions against Afghanistan"]

[Text] Last Saturday, as IZVESTIYA has already reported, President Najibullah of Afghanistan made a statement on Afghan radio and television in which he resolutely condemned the "unprecedented" concentration of Pakistani armed forces subunits in regions on the border with Afghanistan, particularly in [as published] Nangarhar Province. The composition and actions of the subunits, the President stressed, leave no doubt that the armed opposition, aided by Pakistani armed forces, is preparing to seize the provincial center of Jalalabad.

At the same time the capture of Jalalabad, according to the Pakistani military's scheme, is to be just the first step toward the annexation of Afghanistan under the guise of some kind of "Islamic confederation."

The next day the Pakistani Foreign Ministry hastened to repudiate Kabul's allegations as "groundless." A Foreign Ministry spokesman said that Pakistan continues to pursue a consistent policy based on principles that presume an all-embracing political settlement.

At the same time, the reports on the concentration of Pakistani troops on the Afghan border and Pakistani interference in the neighboring country's internal affairs were also denied by Prime Minister Bhutto during an official visit to China.

However, reports from the Afghan Province of Nangarhar attest to the opposite. Some 1,600 Pakistani regular troops and 200 tribal militiamen and batteries of long-range artillery have been transferred to the city of Landi Kotal on the border with Afghanistan.

It is also reported that the Ghaziabad state farm in Nangarhar Province, a farm captured by opposition detachments, has been receiving constant visits by foreign advisers to give help in the siege of Jalalabad.

In the past General Ziaul Haq did not hide his desire to turn Afghanistan into a satellite state under the control of fundamentalists from the armed opposition. "The new government will be truly Islamic, a part of the Islamic revival. Perhaps one day it will be joined by Turkey and Iran and—why not?—Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, too," the general fantasized.

"The ghost of Ziaul Haq," LE MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE writes, "continues to haunt Pakistani and U.S. policy in this regional conflict even now, when the struggle for Kabul and other major Afghan cities is in progress."

In the past Benazir Bhutto invariably criticized the dictator's ambitions and demanded talks for the creation in Kabul of a government based on alliance and compromise. She is now showing caution, the journal points out, avoiding a confrontation with Ziaul Haq's people which could develop into an attempt by the army to oust her.

Despite the democratic elections held in Pakistan, the well organized military intelligence service bequeathed by the late president continues to operate here, distributing military aid among the mujahidin groups and directing and monitoring their actions. Thanks to the efforts of the followers of the former dictator, the course of intensifying interference in the neighboring country's internal affairs has remained unchanged even after the election of the new government in Pakistan. And the plans to incorporate Afghanistan into Pakistan remain alive with it.

The escalation of military preparations on the Pakistan-Afghanistan border cannot fail to cause alarm in the region. Particularly when certain leaders of one state which is a signatory to the Geneva agreements—Pakistan—say that their country is planning on affiliating Afghanistan to itself [prisoyedinit k sebe] while the leader of another country which stands as guarantor to the agreements—President Bush of the United States—announces the continuation of military aid to the Afghan opposition. As the Indian newspaper PATRIOT rightly points out in this connection, "If the international community does not have its say, Afghanistan will become the arena for an unprecedented civil war that will have grave consequences for the entire region."

In striving to unblock the Afghan conflict, the Soviet Union has honestly and consistently fulfilled the terms of the Geneva accords: The final units are now leaving Afghan territory. For its part the Afghan Government is putting forward a concrete program for a political settlement: Its latest efforts to establish contacts with the leaders of the opposition formations operating on the country's territory are yielding considerable results.

But now the consultative council in Rawalpindi conducted by the Afghan opposition under the control of the Pakistani special services and the army is pushing through a plan for the creation of an "Islamic Afghan government" in accordance with Pakistan's will. These are facts that are hard to deny.

Kornilov Criticizes U.S. Aid to Afghan Rebels
LD1502151389 Moscow TASS in English 1449 GMT 15 Feb 89

["TASS Analyst on the Soviet Pull-Out From Afghanistan"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow February 15 TASS—by TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov:

All Soviet troops have finally returned from Afghanistan. Moscow and Kabul have shown the world that their policy of compliance with all the Geneva provisions was consistent and aimed at a comprehensive settlement of the conflict.

The Soviet troops were pulled out of Afghanistan in accordance with the will of the world community. To ignore it and the feelings of the Soviet people themselves would mean to act against the principles of new political thinking, our political statements and goals.

Certainly, the withdrawal of our forces from Afghanistan does not mean that the Soviet Union will back off from Afghan problems. No, emphatically not. We are not indifferent to further developments in this neighbouring country. Moscow is aiming to actively promote a stable political settlement in Afghanistan, to stop the bloodshed and start a constructive dialogue between the warring factions. This is what we should take into account while appraising the international response to the Soviet withdrawal.

"But, look, when something good happens, when tensions between the Soviet Union and the United States are lessened by the Soviet Union doing something good, such as getting out of Afghanistan, we should be very pleased about that," U.S. President George Bush said recently in an interview with THE WALL STREET JOURNAL. We will bear this statement in mind. It is important to say, however, that the United States as well as the Soviet Union is a guarantor of a political settlement in Afghanistan and must actively promote such a settlement and work to stop foreign interference in the internal affairs of the country. The United States has

more than enough influence for this. Why then does the Soviet idea to halt arms deliveries to the warring factions not find support in Washington (and also in Pakistan)? Don't continued deliveries of arms to the rebels and the support of those forces in Pakistan who are striving to question the sovereignty of the neighbouring country and nudging the opposition to separatist actions, terror and violence directly violate the letter and the spirit fo the Geneva Accords?

It is crystal clear today that a Kabul government really representing the will and interests of all layers of Afghan society can be formed only when military activities are stopped in Afghanistan. Different ultimatums and demands to exclude certain influential political forces from the Afghan state structure only serve to whip up tensions in the country and undermine the very idea of setting up a widely representative state body that would end the bloodshed.

"The Soviet invasion is the crux of the matter," certain circles in the West and in Pakistan have alleged in attempts to justify their own interference in the Afghan affairs. There are no more Soviet troops in the country, why does the interference continue?

Both Moscow and Kabul wished and still wish the Soviet withdrawal to bring peace to Afghanistan rather than cause new clashes and new victims. We hope and believe this will still be the case.

Appeal to U.S., Pakistan for Return of POW's

LD1602103489 Moscow TASS in English 2158 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Text] Moscow February 16 TASS—The Soviet public's coordination committee for the release of Soviet servicemen taken prisoner in Afghanistan urged the governments, political parties, public organizations of the United States of America, Pakistan and Afghanistan, and everybody who has a sense of conscience and charity to exert efforts to the utmost to bring about an earlier release of Soviet servicemen held in captivity and their return home.

The committee's address circulated here Wednesday says that the conclusion of the pullback of Soviet troops from Afghanistan's territory "gives a fresh impetus towards achieving a political settlement of the Afghan question, gives the opportunity for the people of that country to decide its internal problems by its own effort through achieving national concord".

The committee points out that the Soviet side has unswervingly fulfilled its obligation for troop withdrawal in keeping with the Geneva accords signed by the USSR, the United States of America, Pakistan and Afghanistan. It is with happiness and joy that we welcome our fathers, brothers and sons, the address says. But those who have been taken prisoner are still kept by the armed Afghan opposition.

The results of the recent Vienna meeting give reason to hope that the world community will not remain indifferent to the destiny of Soviet prisoners of war languishing abroad, the document says. "We wish to believe that the humane approach will ultimately prevail over all sort of political and ideological considerations and that they will exercise their inalienable right to return to their families, to their homes and the native land", the address says.

"Much blood was spilt and many children were orphaned. There is a limit to that. There's enough of tears and grief of mothers and widows," the Soviet public's coordination committee declares.

Bovin Views Lessons of Afghanistan War

AU1602100989 Sofia TRUD in Bulgarian 15 Feb 89 pp 1,4

[Statement by Aleksandr Bovin, "IZVESTIYA foreign policy commentator," in response to "Questions by TRUD Daily"; date, place not given; first paragraph is newspaper's introduction]

[Text] The lessons of Afghanistan are yet to be examined and analyzed. It is very difficult to forecast this country's future.... We approached the popular USSR foreign policy commentator with this and other questions.

I myself posed these questions 2 months ago when I was flying to Kabul. First of all, in 1979 we had very little information. I personally received the announcement of the dispatch of our troops to Afghanistan very calmly. I thought that within 3-4 months we would fulfill our duty, help the government stabilize itself, defeat the foreign counterrevolution, and return home.

When we started to receive news from Afghanistan and began to understand what was going on there, we also began to reevaluate and change our political assessments and the manner in which we perceived events. In the mid-eighties, and perhaps a bit later, I sensed both the futility and fundamental injustice of what was happening. The issue of practical policy as well as the principled question, that we initially overlooked, emerged. Weapons must not be used in restoring order in another country. This is the conclusion we have now reached.

If we invoke the lessons, it is necessary to carefully study everything that happened in Afghanistan and analyze the results. However, one thing is already clear: We must amend our laws in such a way that the decision to dispatch our troops abroad must be adopted not by the Politburo or the government, but by our supreme legislative organ. This is completely clear. Perhaps there are additional political lessons that we must ponder.

The Future of this Country....

The United States continues to violate the Geneva accords and supplies the Afghan opposition with weapons. The United States was also doing this before, however, then it was not committed to an obligation such as the Geneva accords. Now that the Soviet troops have withdrawn, the situation has changed completely, and I think that from a judicial point of view, interference can no longer be justified. I think that regardless of the development of further events, for a certain time the clashes will continue. However, the international climate gives grounds for the hope that the situation in Afghanistan could quiet down. Nevertheless, it is very difficult to forecast when this change will take place.

Ties With Israel Require Settlement in Mideast
LD1602094389 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1600 GMT 14 Feb 89

[Text] [Unidentified Announcer] Our guest commentator Nikolay Grechkov will answer a question from a friend: Nawras Adil Ali from Syria. The question is: Does the USSR's new political thinking reflect a change in policy vis-a-vis Israel, as is written in some Western papers?

[Grechkov] Dear listener Nawras Adil Ali, in order to answer this question it is probably necessary to recall some of the principles on which our country's new thinking rests. One of these principles is that every people must be guaranteed the right to chose its own course of national development. It would not be difficult, if we consider the Middle East, to see that the Palestinian Arab people are completely deprived of such a right and have been living under Israeli occupation for more than 20 years. It is known that Israel occupied the West Bank and Gaza Strip during its agression against the Arab countries in June 1967, and that very aggression was the reason for the severing of diplomatic relations between Moscow and Tel Aviv. The Israeli occupation is still going on and the Palestinian people are still denied their national rights and aspirations. For this reason, Soviet-Israeli diplomatic relations have not yet been resumed.

[Announcer] Our Syrian listener said Western media stress that the day when relations will be resumed is not far off. What is your opinion?

[Grechkov] I would like to recall what official Soviet spokesmen have repeatedly reiterated in their statements: This question can be resolved only within the framework of a Middle East settlement. In other words the resumption of Soviet-Israeli relations can be addressed only if the Israeli leadership recognizes the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, and if it agrees to take part in an international conference on the Middle East, under the auspices of the United Nations and with the participation of all concerned parties, including the PLO. Moscow believes that this conference could create the conditions necessary for the political settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict as a whole. I would also like to recall that abandoning confrontation and turning to political dialogue to resolve international issues, including regional issues, is another of the basic principles of the new thinking, bearing in mind that issues should be resolved on the basis of considering and balancing the interests of all parties involved in conflicts, namely the interests of the Arab peoples and the Israeli people. This is the Soviet stand in light of the new political thinking

[Announcer] Thank you for answering the questions of our listeners.

Iran Said Undergoing 'Serious Changes'
PM1602113389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Feb 89 Morning Edition p 4

[A. Ostalskiy commentary: "Evidence of Changes"; follows account of IRNA report on speech by Ayatollah Montazeri calling for "open society"]

[Text] "Congratulations and condolences!" is how Iranians are supposed to address the mothers and other relatives of people who perished in the war against Iraq. It is hard to say to what extent the grief from loss is actually counterbalanced by the hope of Allah's mercy. Throughout the 8 years of the war official Iranian propaganda claimed that thousands of Iranians were eagerly sacrificing their lives in "human wave" attacks on Iraqi tanks and mine fields. But for all the real displays of fanatical belief and contempt for death, it was impossible to totally believe that people could feel no fear, pain, and compassion at all.

The statement by Ayatollah Montazeri that we have published today has caused an international sensation. It testifies that Iran is today experiencing a dramatic moment in its history.

Western news agencies are reporting on executions in Iran and on an exacerbating political struggle and disagreements within the leadership—between the president, the prime minister, and the speaker of parliament. Above this entire complex pyramid of power stands Ayatollah Khomeyni, Iran's spiritual leader, who, according to those same reports, is now in failing health. How accurate are the reports? It is hard for us to judge this since there has long been no Soviet journalist working permanently in Iran.

But the fact that Montazeri, who was officially appointed Khomeyni's successor several years ago, is publicly coming out with sharp criticisms today shows that serious changes are under way in Iran. One can only agree with him that the acknowledgment of errors and the ability to rectify them are a necessary condition of the normal development and progress of any society.

Sub-Saharan Africa

RSA 'Sortie' Threatens Tripartite Agreement

PM1502155989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Feb 89 Second Edition p 5

[Vladimir Tyurkin "Correspondent Comment": "Clouds on the Horizon"]

[Text] Luanda, 13 Feb—Clouds have gathered again over Angola. South African Army forces crossed the border the other day and came into contact with the Angolan Army. The conflict, which had died down, began to smolder again.

"Climate of peace," "climate of trust"—it is these words that are perhaps most often repeated in commentaries on a settlement in southwest Africa. After the signing of the New York agreements, which paved the way for a peace settlement, a wave of euphoria swept through cities and villages, ravaged by war and hardship, in Angola, Namibia, and other countries of the region. Sober-minded whites in South Africa and Namibia also welcomed the accords as a step leading in the right direction out of the blind alley of suicidal confrontation with black Africa.

The Christmas and New Year celebrations took place in the region in an atmosphere of hope, and further reassuring steps were taken in early January—the first 3,000 Cuban internationalists were withdrawn from Angola as a gesture of goodwill, a permanent Angolan-Cuban-South African commission was set up to monitor implementation of the tripartite agreement concluded on 22 December 1988 in New York, and the UN commission to monitor the withdrawal of Cuban forces started work in Angola.

The primary condition, the foundation on which trust in international affairs rests, was clearly formulated by the Romans: "Agreements must be observed." This condition has been grossly violated by Pretoria.

The 8 February sortie from Namibian territory, although far smaller in purely military terms than previous acts of aggression by South Africa, carries a potentially massive destructive force which threatens the entire political settlement process. Indeed, it is a blow to the letter and spirit of the tripartite agreement, to attempts to establish a climate of trust in the region, to hopes for a resolution of the conflict.

It appears that influential opponents of a settlement in South Africa and Namibia from among ultrarightist politicians and "hawks" in the army thought it was the right moment to "verify" for themselves the effectiveness of the accords. The degree of uncertainty in the top echelons of power in South Africa connected with President P. Botha's illness and with the change of leadership in the ruling nationalist party may also have contributed to the army's "baring its teeth."

Be that as it may, the view that the settlement process will by no means be strewn with roses has been confirmed. The main thing now is to ensure that the provocateurs do not achieve their aim, that the international community uses all of its authority and all the levers at its disposal—through bilateral relations and via the United Nations—and ensures that everyone fulfills his pledges.

The visit Angolan President E. dos Santos has just paid to the capital of Congo, Brazzaville—where, as is known, the most crucial talks have been taking place within the framework of a settlement in southwest Africa—demonstrated that Angola, while keeping its powder dry and being prepared to rebuff encroachments on its territory, still sees ensuring a political solution of the conflict by peaceful means as the chief task.

As President E. dos Santos announced, Angola protested to the South African Government. Luanda will supply the permanent joint commission to monitor the implementation of the tripartite agreement with the relevant facts and will demand strict implementation of the New York accords.

When dealing with such a frequently unpredictable and, to be frank, unreliable partner as Pretoria, anything can happen. The only guarantee of further progress toward the goal is the African countries' firmness and restraint and the solidarity and joint actions of the international community.

Scientist on 'Arrest' of Soviet Ship

PM1502114389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Feb 89 First Edition p 4

[Comment by Doctor of Physicomathematical Sciences Vadim Timofeyevich Paka, deputy director of the Atlantic Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences P.P. Shirshov Oceanology Institute: "How Soviet Ship Was Arrested; Scientific Research Ship 'Akademik Mstislav Keldysh' Was Under Arrest for a Week in an African Country"; first paragraph is KRASNAYA ZVEZDA introduction]

[Text] At the request of Captain Second Rank A. Pilipchuk, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's permanent correspondent in the Baltic Fleet, Doctor of Physicomathematical Sciences Vadim Timofeyevich Paka, deputy director of the Atlantic Department of the P.P. Shirshov Institute of Oceanology, comments on this event:

"The Atlantic Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Oceanology is the owner of the scientific research ship *Akademik Mstislav Keldysh*. The ship, built in Finland, carries deep-water manned research apparatus. On its last voyage the scientific research ship had on board two 'Paysis' apparatuses. The ship sailed out to the ocean to undertake full-scale tests on them after repair and reequipping with the participation of West German firms.

"In the capital of the African state of Sierra Leone, the port of Freetown, the scientific research ship was to take West German specialists on board. This place was selected by mutual agreement. The entry into the port was registered in accordance with the established procedure. But a day later the port authorities arrested the ship on the pretext that it was a military ship since it had on board... submarines. This was despite the fact that there are registers of all deep-water apparatuses of this type.

"In addition, the international scientific communisty is extensively informed regarding the existence and potential of the apparatuses—no one doubts that they were not created for military purposes. Nonetheless, the Sierra Leone authorities, not satisfied with the results of an examination by port employees, created a commission. Diplomatic efforts on the Soviet side were needed for the arrest to be lifted from the ship 10 February. I stress that all this time Captain V. Kazmin, the crew, and the scientists displayed restraint and calm.

"Who needed this strange arrest of a Soviet scientific research ship? It is hard to say. Nevertheless, the 'action' did not achieve its aim. The ship is now continuing its voyage."

Senegal Party Delegation Visits Moscow
PM1602085189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Feb 89 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Guests From Senegal"]

[Text] A delegation of the Senegalese Independence and Labor Party led by A. Dansoko, general secretary of the Central Committee, was in the USSR 2-11 February at the CPSU Central Committee's invitation. The Senegalese comrades became acquainted with the progress of restructuring in the USSR and had meetings and conversations in CPSU Central Committee departments.

The Independence and Labor Party delegation took part in a Soviet-Senegalese symposium organized by the Institute of Social Sciences under the CPSU Central Committee on urgent problems of economic and sociopolitical development in African countries.

Professor Comments on African Socialism
LD1402224289 Moscow in Portuguese to Africa 1800 GMT 19 Jan 89

[Kosukhin speaks in Russian, fading into translation read by second announcer]

[Text] [First announcer] Today we have with us once again African affairs specialist Professor Nikolay Kosukhin. What are the theories and concepts of development in modern Africa? What is their essence? What do they have in common? Where do they differ? Such are the topics of today's talk:

[Second announcer] The ideological situation in Africa is characterized by its originality and peculiarity. At the root of the present development concepts adopted in various African countries is the theory of pan-Africanism, which emerged at the end of the last century and became a kind of foundation for the spiritual revival of the oppressed peoples. During the colonialist era this theory undoubtedly played a progressive role.

Leopold Senghor's theory of African socialism continues to influence the African Continent's ideological life. It emphasizes the specificity of the African character as opposed to the European. I would go so far as to say that Leopold Senghor exalted the originality of the Africans. This is why his theory is also known as the theory of lyrical socialism.

It is precisely the notion of Africa's original and unique character that can be found in various guises in the concepts that emerged in other countries of the continent. It can be said that the very same Senghor exerted, and continues to exert, a considerable influence on Africa's ideological and political life. In my opinion his ideas played an important role during the period of liberation from colonial rule, and contributed to the growth of the African peoples' awareness, of their aspirations to independence.

[First announcer] In the 30-odd years since Africa's liberation, there also emerged a multiplicity of "isms" among which it is sometimes difficult to find one's bearings—all the more so since, in nearly all these "isms," the word "socialism" puts in an appearance in one way or another.

[Second announcer] Yes, in effect each leader wanted to formulate his views on his country's development in the context of the African reality. The ideas of socialism were also disseminated widely on the continent but were absorbed in a very original way. In order to find one's bearings in this diversity of ideological currents it must be borne in mind that, underlying each of them, there are specific social class forces. For this reason, whether he likes it or not, each leader also reflects the interests and goals of very specific forces. This is understandable, and it is from this standpoint that I approach the problem.

[First announcer] There are in Africa many revolutionary or national democracies. What would you single out as their main concepts?

[Second announcer] From among the theories of a national democratic character I would single out Kenneth Kaunda's Zambian humanism. Kaunda regards it as a social and ideological current superior to socialism and even to communism. He believes that the African way of life brings together the concepts of individual ownership of some means of production and of collective work in the community. This is the ideal that must be aimed at.

In the same current I would place Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, and Burkina Faso, whose leaders talk of building a new and just society, but where the word "socialism" is avoided. The leaderships of these countries are characterized by their pragmatism. They promote the development of mixed economies and actively seek to attract foreign capital. At the same time, they pursue progressive policies on the international arena. They wish to develop relations with both the socialist and the capitalist countries and have achieved some success in the solution of their domestic problems.

[First announcer] There are also parties in Africa which have opted for scientific socialism as the theoretical basis for their work, first and foremost the Congo, Ethiopia, Angola, and Mozambique. One of the theoreticians of scientific socialism was Amilcar Cabral [of Guinea-Bissau], awarded an honorary degree in 1972 by the Africa Institute. Unfortunately, however, the socialist course, the theory of scientific socialism, did not shield these countries from all manner of ills. In a previous program we already talked about the lessons of the socialist orientation in Africa. However, could it legitimately be said that African society has become mature enough to embrace the theory of scientific socialism?

[Second announcer] I believe the main thing is not to proclaim the establishment of a socialist society as soon as independence has been attained. This was, in effect, the mistake of our Mozambican friends, for example. The point is that, using the scientific theory for guidance, it is necessary to appraise the situation correctly and adopt a policy in keeping with the level of development and conditions in a given country.

Obviously the African countries too may choose the socialist outlook. At the present stage, however, it is important to resolve the general tasks of democracy. To speak immediately of socialist change in these countries would be markedly premature. Indeed, it is now clear how the attempt to leap-frog led to negative results which to some extent compromised the idea of the construction of socialism. Incidentally, the aforementioned Amilcar Cabral was a very sensible Marxist who fully realized that socialism could not be achieved overnight by a backward Africa dominated by a variety of economic infrastructures. First there was a long way to go in the resolution of a multiplicity of development problems.

[First announcer] The very variety of names and concepts listed in your talk shows the richness of Africa's ideological and political life. In your opinion, what criteria should one apply to appraise a given theory?

[Second announcer] To appraise a given theory we must above all be guided by the criteria of social progress, evaluating the extent to which such a theory meets the real conditions of the stage of development in which a given country finds itself. We must verify whether this theory contributes to economic development and to the solution of social problems. I believe that this particular juncture, with such a lively, ongoing debate on alternative development theories, that is to say, a development along lines other than those of capitalism and socialism, places Africa in a particularly interesting light. Its wealth of ideological currents is a contribution to social and political thinking worldwide.

[First announcer] This has been a conversation with African affairs specialist Prof Nikolay Kosukhin.

East Europe

Poland's Urban Comments on Roundtable Process

LD1102125389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 11 Feb 89

[From the "In the Countries of Socialism" program presented by political observer Valeriy Korzin; interview with Polish Government Spokesman Jerzy Urban by Korzin in Moscow; date not given—recorded; Urban speaks in Polish with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] We will start with Poland. I think this is understandable—in connection with the roundtable meeting, which is called upon to unite the various political and public forces, particularly great attention is being given to that country at this time. You already know, of course, that a PZPR Central Committee Plenum was held in Warsaw, and although it would seem enough time has already passed, discussions are continuing in Poland and throughout the world. There is continuing comment on the plenum, which was tense and even dramatic, and the essence of the decisions adopted at the plenum because they reflected the party's fundamentally new approach to the development of Polish society. I repeat, very much is being said about these decisions, both for and against. But I have been fortunate enough to have the opportunity to receive information from the horse's mouth, as the saying goes. Comrade Urban, the Polish government's press representative, was in Moscow for a few days, and I would like to present for your attention my conversation with him:

[Korzin] Comrade Urban, I would like to begin the interview in an unconventional way. What is that badge you have on your lapel? [video shows close-up of a badge with caricature of Urban and the words "I love you" in English]

[Urban] I was given this by students. Such badges are mass-produced by the student opposition. It is a caricature of me. It has the words: I love you.

[Korzin] My first question is precisely about the opposition. The plenum's decisions envisage the possibility of political opposition in Poland; this, naturally, entails recognition of Solidarity. At least this is what is supposed. What has changed since the beginning of the 1980's? Has Solidarity changed? Has the Polish leadership changed?

[Urban] Both sides have changed. Within Solidarity the way of thinking of a section of the members has changed. There is still a certain section which does not want to talk to us at all. We also want nothing to do with them. Now these people are attacking Walesa. That is an attack from the right wing, although there are leftist tendencies, too. So circumstances are bringing solidarity's leading nucleus somewhat closer to us. At the same time the economic and political reforms which they approve are continuing. This, by the way, as well as such phenomena as the progress of restructuring in the USSR and the process of East-West detente, has created conditions for our country to rethink the problem of the opposition. We now regard this matter rather differently, and they, too, regard it rather differently.

[Korzin] A question arises in this connection. What will be the fate of the new trade unions which currently exist?

[Urban] Membership in the new trade unions is 7 million. That is a lot for Poland. Some 60-70 percent are former members of Solidarity. One can envisage that they will remain the largest trade organization. Perhaps a proportion of their members will transfer to Solidarity. Perhaps some other different, independent trade unions will spring up. The concept is that at each enterprise there will be, without competition, a general representation of all existing trade unions and those which arise later. Walesa and those around him approve of this.

[Korzin] This process, apparently, is not regarded so equably by Comrade Miodowicz who, I know, voted against the decision.

[Urban] He voted against because he was tied by the decision of the trade union leadership.

[Korzin] Apparently Comrade Miodowicz, as leader of the new trade unions, was obliged to defend the right of his organization to exist. But I would like to ask another question on this issue, although it is not connected with trade unions. In the new conditions, what will the PZPR's role be?

[Urban] This role must change greatly. First there must be self-limitation of its spheres of influence, where it relies directly on leadership by directives. There must be new relations with the administration, influencing the administration via elected parliamentary bodies, people's councils, and so on. The party is prepared to reduce its participation in parliament, to act together with a coalition of friendly parties and not independently. Apart from that, it is a question of the party's becoming a living political organism which influnces peoples' minds, not just departments. These are very deep and far-reaching changes.

[Korzin] One hears opinions being expressed at present about whether the processes taking place in Poland, the pluralism which is developing, could lead to total anarchy if the processes get out of control.

[Urban] There is no doubt that all of this bears a political risk. But it is difficult to move forward without a certain amount of risk. This risk is particularly evident in Poland, where we had the bad experience of 1981. But we must hope that neither we nor our potential partners will commit the old mistakes. In any event, Walesa puts particular stress on the need to think everything through and to act in such a way as to prevent anarchy. Thus, the other side has also come to understand that these cannot be unchecked processes which are not subject to political consideration. They recognize that everything must be gradually tested, and must rely on agreement and not on conflict.

[Korzin] I think you understand that the decisions adopted at the plenum are not some sort of conclusion of the process, but rather its very, very beginning. Foundations have been laid for cooperation among all existing social forces. Life will show how this cooperation works out and how fruitful its results will be. One thing is clear: The majority in the PZPR and the government, and the majority of those who in the past actively opposed them, have come to understand that without a uniting of forces, without taking existing realities into account, any progress is simply impossible.

Paper Portrays Walesa, Solidarity Revival

PM1502112089 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Feb 89 p 3

[Own correspondent V. Shutkevich article under the rubric "View": "Not a Man of Iron: Sketches for a Political Portrait of Lech Walesa"]

[Text] Warsaw—The main news in Poland today is the "roundtable" discussions, which have been going on for several days now in the Council of Ministers building on Krakowskie Przedmiescie. This event is indeed out of the ordinary. For the first time since August 1981, the authorities have entered into direct talks with the opposition. Representatives of all the country's political parties and various social organizations and political groups have gathered at the "roundtable." But it is the participation of former "Solidarity" figures, headed by its leader Lech Walesa, that is a fundamentally new element in the country's internal life.

Let us be frank: Even for us journalists, this turn of events was in many ways unexpected. Naturally, it also prompts many questions from our readers. A reminder: The "Independent, Self-Managing Trade Union 'Solidarity'"—to give it its full title—sprang up in summer 1980. A year later it was disbanded by a decision of the Polish authorities. Since then our press has written about it only in critical terms. Lech Walesa also came in for criticism. In recent years his name was hardly found in our newspapers, and even the Polish press write about Walesa comparatively infrequently, and only as a "private individual." But now the authorities have

begun a dialogue with him. What is happening in Poland? A return to "Solidarity"? Movement forward? And if so, where to? And who, finally, is this Walesa?

One misconception must be dispelled immediately. As soon as Walesa is mentioned, many of us recall the phrase "man of iron." That was the title of Andrzej Wajda's movie, shown in Moscow's movie theaters for the first time at the end of last year. The movie tells the story of a man who led a strike of Gdansk shipyard workers in the fall of 1980. Walesa was indeed head of a strike committee at that time. But he was not the prototype for the "man of iron," although he did participate directly in the making of the movie.

His life story was disappointing—he was not born to the part. According to Wajda's scenario, the hero of his movie is a city dweller by birth. Walesa grew up in the remote village of Popowo, somewhere between Warsaw and Gdansk. In the movie the hero arrives at the shipyard after graduating from the VUZ. Walesa never studied at an institute.

Many years later he was to write about this in his autobiographical book "A Path of Hope." But at that time the book was still a long way off. His name appeared in the newspapers for the first time at the time of the Gdansk shipbuilders strike in December 1970.

The immediate cause of the events was an increase in meat prices announced by the government just before Christmas. A strike began, and spilled beyond the shipyard gates. The militia opened fire. There were 44 dead and more than 1,000 wounded.

It was then that the 27-year-old electrician Walesa first became chairman of the shipyard strike committee. Later, together with other delegates, he took part in talks with the authorities and, with them, gave his word to the then Polish leader Edward Gierek, who asked the workers to support his initiatives: "We will help!"

Gierek hoped to overcome economic difficulties, which his predecessor Gomulka had failed to deal with, with the help of foreign credit. The slogan was put forward of creating a "new Poland," in which every Pole would have a small car and every family an individual apartment. For some years Poland was in the grip of consumer euphoria. Western goods, licenses, and equipment were widespread.

But the time came to sober up. It suddenly emerged that three-fourths of the credit had been spent, and the desired economic breakthrough had not happened.

A storm was gathering over the country. Its approach was perhaps felt most intensely in the Wybrzeze. There were reasons for this. All over the world shipbuilding was going through a grave crisis. There were fewer and fewer orders, while oil prices were increasing. Shipbuilders in Gdansk did not have enough work, and their wages were being cut. But Walesa did not experience the effects himself—he was no longer working at the shipyard.

Four years later Walesa appeared here again. He appeared, on his own admission, "like a thief in the night," jumping the fence in secret.

In the morning the siren sounded the alarm over the shipyard and the air was filled like lightning with the short, dry word "strike." Walesa was promptly placed on the strike committee as a victim of the authorities' tyranny. He became actively involved in enumerating the list of demands: Reinstate those who were unlawfully dismissed, himself included; increase workers wages by an average of Z2000; erect a monument to the victims of 1970.... The administration was forced to agree to these terms. But Walesa called for the strike to continue—in token of support for workers at other enterprises who had put forward similar demands. The shipyard director was indignant: "We did not agree to that—this is a strike of solidarity." And so the word was uttered that was soon to become the name of the new trade union.

Did "Solidarity" really spring up of its own accord, or was it, as the newspapers wrote, patently not of Polish origin? A question of fundamental importance. It is well known that a conference of emigre circles took place in Geneva in 1975, which sanctioned the formation in Poland of the so-called "Workers Defense Committee" (KOR), later renamed the "Social Self-Defense Committee" (KOS). The committee's program made it unequivocally clear that KOR sought to create a crisis in the country as a "necessary condition for the development of the struggle against the socialist regime."

"Walesa was a lieutenant in the trenches, but not, of course, the staff of the strike front," the West German magazine DER SPIEGEL wrote in 1980. "There was a 'nerve center' made up of KOR representatives, ready at any moment and in any circumstances to act as adviser to any strike committee." It is noteworthy that a couple of days after the government's recognition of "Solidarity" it was suggested that Walesa give up his post to one of the KOR leaders—Kuron, Michnik, or Modzelewski. As Walesa scathingly recalls, some people probably found him "too weak in the head, not revolutionary enough, and excessively malleable toward the authorities." He did not at all fit in with the sketch of a "man of iron."

But neither, in my opinion, does he fit into the framework of Kuron's obedient "lieutenant," a "political dilettante not without skill." This does not fit, because it does not answer the main question: Why did millions of workers follow Walesa? In 1981 "Solidarity's" ranks included some 8 (or according to other sources, 10) million people, 1 million of whom were party members....

However, in my view the most sophisticated machinations by KOR together with all the special services of Western countries would not have given "Solidarity" such breadth, had there not existed in Poland a powerful social base for protest. Lech Walesa became the voice of this protest, and later its symbol. This was beyond the powers of anyone from KOS-KOR. "I was convinced," Walesa later recalled, "that people would not follow even the most brilliant theorist, because he did not work alongside them, they did not know him, they were afraid of 'manipulation' on his part...." What was needed was a man who could become the voice of this protest, its symbol, in the eyes of society. In a sense it was not Walesa who created "Solidarity," but "Solidarity" that created Walesa. Had he not existed, someone else would have appeared.

Walesa's coveralls secured him the solidarity of his colleagues and enabled him to become head of "Solidarity." But what helped him to hold on to the leadership of a movement of many millions of people was certainly his outstanding psychological sensitivity and his oratorical skills.

The sympathy of many Poles is also aroused by the fact that Walesa is a believer, a good family man, and a father of eight. Sometimes it even looks as if he deliberately emphasizes his allegiance to the church and the norms of traditional Christian morality. A badge representing the Virgin Mary can always be seen on the lapel of his vest....

Walesa's political tastes are much more difficult to judge. He himself does everything possible to avoid making concrete statements on this score. "There is no such thing as socialist bread and capitalist bread," he said in an interview. "Good bread is bread that everyone has enough of."

Some people say that "Solidarity" is now entirely different and that its leader has "matured" in recent years. Yes, he now appears much more restrained, realistic, and wise. But I do not think Walesa's views have changed very much. In any event, he has clearly not become a supporter of socialism, although he admitted recently that under socialism "there are a couple of good things too." So what has changed in the country? Why did the authorities invite to the "roundtable" not only Walesa, but experts from his entourage who could hardly be suspected of socialist sympathies—Kuron, Michnik, and others?

The world itself has changed. Under the influence of Soviet foreign policy, the policy of the new thinking, a different form of East-West relations is developing. "We remember," Polish Government Spokesman J. Urban noted recently, "how the West used to push the internal Polish opposition toward a policy of confrontation. That has now changed substantially. Progress in the implementation of the policy of restructuring and glasnost in the USSR influences the PZPR, political circles in our country, and the opposition itself. The opposition's anti-Sovietism is disappearing, diminishing."

The need for this change was also dictated by the internal situation in the country. In the last 2 years, again according to J. Urban, mistakes were made in economic policy. People's living standards continued to fall and inflation grew rapidly. As a result the public mood deteriorated both with regard to the former government and with regard to the authorities in general. All this led to a revival of the myth of "Solidarity," on which some Poles pin their hopes for changes for the better. More than 300 illegal "Solidarity" organizations have sprung up at enterprises, including large enterprises. It must be observed, however, that "Solidarity" is no longer the monolithic and cohesive force it was in 1980. Its division into two wings has become marked. One wing, which has taken the title "Fighting 'Solidarity,'" is categorically opposed to any compromise with the authorities, and believes that socialism in Poland must be replaced by another political system. The other section of the opposition, while recognizing the existing constitutional order, demands profound reforms in the country.

The need for such reforms is acknowledged today by the whole of Polish society, including the authorities. This is the direction in which the country's new government, headed by Mieczyslaw Rakowski, is operating. It recently adopted a number of important laws designed to give complete freedom to the state, cooperative, and mixed sectors, strengthen the position of the national currency, and attract foreign capital. Changes in the economy will entail changes in politics. In past years it has become clear how pernicious a monopoly, in whatever sphere, can be for socialism. The idea is gaining support that opposition is not such an alien phenomenon to socialist society that every effort must be made to eradicate it. Moreover, a constructive opposition that acknowledges the existing system can even be useful, since it promotes the birth of new ideas and protects society against stagnation. Hence the path to pluralism in the broad sense is opening up.

Do "Solidarity" and its leaders now have sufficient will and courage to avoid a repetition of the lessons of the past, use the opportunity for legalization intelligently, and exploit it for Poland's good? One would like to hope so. In any event, Walesa has recently been emphasizing constantly that he advocates not revolution, but evolution; that the path of strikes, anarchy, and demagoguery is fatal for Poland. National consensus is needed.

Unfortunately there are still grounds for concern today. The "roundtable" debates have barely begun. Three of the working parties are discussing how to lead the country out of the crisis, improve the political system, and lead the economy forward. But at the country's biggest open-cut coal pit, in Belchatow, a strike is again under way, and one of the participants in the "roundtable," A. Pietrzak, is hurrying there to support

the strikers on behalf of Lech Walesa. At the same time representatives of the extremist wing of the opposition, rejecting the possibility of dialogue with the authorities, are again accusing Walesa of treachery and demanding that he be replaced by a "man of iron"....

"Men of iron" are fine in movies or romantic poems: "You could make nails from these people: No nails in the world would be stronger." But in real life, people of a different kind are far more necessary—people who know how to think independently, find compromises, and make responsible decisions.

Delegation Studies PZPR Role in Agriculture

PM1602084389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
12 Feb 89 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Exchange of Experience"]

[Text] A delegation of CPSU Central Committee members and members of the Ukrainian, Belorussian, and Latvian Communist Party Central Committees led by D.K. Motornyy, member of the CPSU Central Committee, twice Hero of Socialist Labor, and chairman of the Kirov kolkhoz in Kherson Oblast, was in Poland in accordance with the plan for ties between the CPSU and the PZPR 6-11 February.

The delegation visited Warsaw, Bydgoszcz, Torun, and Wroclaw Voivodships, where it became acquainted with the experience of the work of PZPR organizations in the agricultural sphere. It was received by B. Kolodziejczak, member of the PZPR Central Committee Secretariat.

GDR Prices Debate Seen Relevant to USSR

PM1502135189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
13 Feb 89 First Edition p 5

[Article by correspondent M. Podklyuchnikov: "What Is To Be Done With Prices?—From the GDR Press"]

[Text] Berlin—"In our country recently there has been a lively discussion on questions of price formation. It is clear that economic scientists are encountering similar problems in other socialist countries. Perhaps they will answer the question of what is to happen to prices? L.Popkova, a teacher, from Kuybyshev."

The GDR's economists have been discussing the question of what is to be done with retail prices for consumer goods and services and with apartment rents and transport fares. In many instances in the country they are below cost price. The state budget allocates M65.7 billion in a year to maintain stable prices and apartment rents, and this is out of a general budget expenditure of M266 billion.

Of course, a permanent state subsidy creates certain problems, attention to which was drawn by BERLINER ZEITUNG. Let us take, for example, basic food goods. Agriculture in the GDR operates efficiently, and there is no shortage of food products. Furthermore, in terms of the annual per capita consumption of a number of important types of food, the country is one of the world's leaders. For example, prices have remained unchanged since 1955 and in that time the consumption of meat and meat products has increased from 45 kg to 99.4 kg, consumption of eggs (including products made from eggs) has risen from 116 to 303, milk consumption has grown from 90.7 liters to 108.3 liters, cheese consumption has risen from 3 kg to 9.5 kg, and vegetable consumption is up from 37 kg to 102 kg.

The maintenance of stable prices means that the discrepancy between them and expenditure on the production of output has also been preserved. BERLINER ZEITUNG cites the following example: The production of the "traditional" bread roll costs 10 pfennigs whereas the customer pays just 5 pfennigs for it. The state pays the other half.

With such a price structure a situation emerges whereby the higher the consumption of subsidized goods, the more the state has to pay.

In this connection the GDR has had to resolve a difficult task: what to do with the millions of visitors and tourists who come to the country each year? For example, according to figures published recently, there were almost 3,580,000 trips to the GDR from the FRG last year and around 1,980,000 trips from West Berlin; more than 1.5 million people visited the country from other nonsocialist countries as well. The logical question is: Why should the state subsidy be applied to them, too, even though, of course, they do not help create the national income? This question was answered by the recent introduction of new customs regulations banning the export of a number of articles from the country.

But there is another aspect of the problem of retail prices and subsidies. Attention was drawn to it by the well-known economist Dr Juergen Kuczynski in NEUES DEUTSCHLAND. He expressed an opinion that could also be considered a contribution to the discussion in our country. The academician noted: The dangerous element in the arguments against the maintenance of stable prices is that they seem logical and, economically, completely correct—but they are nevertheless fundamentally wrong.

J. Kuczynski agrees that stable prices often fall below production costs. He also agrees that prices for goods which are not prime necessities often considerably exceed production costs. Nor does he dispute that only subsidies enable producers to cover their costs and earn the necessary profit, or that the raising of retail prices would counter the squandering of grain, water, and electricity, which still takes place. It is also true that the raising of prices could be accompanied by a raising of pensions and the incomes of low-paid groups of the population—then the state would still gain.

However, the academician recalls, the socialist countries' experience shows: Wherever price stability has been abandoned, even if linked with an increase in pensions and the incomes of the low-paid sectors of the population, those sectors have still been the first to suffer.

The author of the NEUES DEUTSCHLAND article comes to the conclusion that it is better to live with "silly prices" that nevertheless do have a profound point. They enable everyone to avoid hunger, freezing in winter, and homelessness. In one sense, J. Kuczynski writes, we have ensured a unique living standard: In our country everyone, including those on the smallest pension or lowest wage, has the minimum necessary for existence. The policy of stable prices for prime necessities should be thanked for that.

The BERLINER ZEITUNG article also reaches the conclusion that in a working people's state, subsidies serve the good of the people. What is needed is not a raising of prices but a lowering of the prime cost of output, an increase in labor productivity, and the introduction of scientific and technical achievements.

As for the thesis that subsidies are contrary to the principle of payment according to labor, the BERLINER ZEITUNG remarks that this is wrong. In the provision for basic needs, everyone has identical conditions. But on the whole, income depends on the quantity and quality of labor.

Such is the course of the discussions among our German friends. They view their problems in the context of their country's specific conditions. But their arguments should undoubtedly also be studied by those taking part in the price discussion in the USSR.

West Europe

FRG's Genscher Favors Continuing Disarmament

LD1402164989 Moscow TASS in English 1622 GMT 14 Feb 89

[Text] Bonn February 14 TASS—The FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher has gone on record for continuing the disarmament process in the sphere of conventional and nuclear armaments, and also for a general and complete ban on chemical weapons. The point in question now, he stressed in an interview to the Deutchlandfunk broadcasting station, is to achieve more security and stability by means of a far-reaching policy of disarmament. Very important, he said, is the reduction of conventional weapons, restructuring of armed forces in such a way as to rule out the possibility of any surprise attack or large-scale offensive operations.

Turning to the question of modernizing tactical nuclear missiles, deployed in the FRG, Genscher noted that the term of their validity would expire only in 1995. This is why both he and Chancellor Kohl had repeatedly stressed that there was no reason for any haste in this question.

Speaking about his attitude to the Soviet Union's policy, the leader of the FRG diplomatic service said that during yesterday's talk between Chancellor Kohl and Secretary of State James Baker both sides had shown interest in the success of the Soviet leadership's policy of reforms.

In the light of this American-West German meeting, Hans-Jochen Vogel, chairman of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, urged the Bonn government to come out unequivocally against the modernization of tactical nuclear weapons deployed in the FRG. If the chancellor tells the FRG allies clearly and unequivocally that Bonn does not wish any further arms stockpiling, Vogel said in Bonn today, he can rely on the complete backing of the Social-Democrats.

Italy's De Mita Supports Expanding Relations

PM1502141589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Feb 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent M. Ilyinskiy dispatch under the rubric "Panorama of International Events": "Looking to the Future With Hope; Statement by the Chairman of the Italian Council of Ministers for IZVESTIYA"]

[Text] Rome—In the Hall of the Maritime Republics of the ancient Cuigi Palace, the official residence of the Italian Council of Ministers, I was scheduled a meeting with Nazzareno Pagani, head of the press department attached to the secretariat of the Italian Council of Ministers chairman, Ciriaco de Mita. The Soviet diplomats who were involved in the establishment of diplomatic relations with Italy have been in this very hall. The Soviet-Italian Treaty on Trade and Navigation was signed in Rome on 7 February 1924. On 7-11 February 1924, notes were exchanged between the Italian and Soviet Governments on the de jure recognition of the Soviet Union and the establishment of Soviet-Italian diplomatic relations. And now, 65 years later, I was having a conversation with Nazzareno Pagani on the current state of Soviet-Italian ties. The head of the press department acquainted me with a brief statement issued by Ciriaco de Mita, chairman of the Italian Council of Ministers, especially for IZVESTIYA. Here is the text of the statement:

"At this time of great hope and change in the Soviet Union, Italy would like to deepen cooperation with the USSR in all areas—not only within the framework of trade and economic exchange but also in the context of broadening social and cultural ties.

"A large number of the problems appearing on the horizon today require global solutions which transcend national boundaries.

"I hope that the current favorable period of detente will lead to the strengthening of detente and allow the leaders of different countries to seek forms of joint responsibility in the implementation of international policy, leaving the ideological baggage of confrontation and hostility, from which no one can benefit, in the past."

"The Italian Government," Nazzareno Pagani said, "believes ties between our countries can serve as an example of relations between states with different socio-economic and political systems. The world is contradictory and complex, but it is also interdependent. Differences between countries are not a pretext for confrontation but, on the contrary, a reason to broaden the exchange of opinions, competition, and cooperation for the good of everyone and for the sake of general progress.

"With the development of the new political thinking, Soviet-Italian relations have been given a powerful boost in recent years. The visit to the Soviet Union by Ciriaco de Mita, chairman of the Italian Council of Ministers, in October 1988 was an important event in international life. It proceeded in a free, mutually interested atmosphere. Questions concerning the further all-around development of Soviet-Italian relations were raised. We have established a solid reserve of mutual cooperation and laid good groundwork for the future.

"The realism of the Soviet leadership is meeting with realism on the part of the Italian leadership in the context of analyzing perceptions and appraisals of international prospects and continuing a constructive dialogue, regardless of the circumstances stemming from the fact that the sides belong to different military-political and economic alliances. This ensured that the visit was conducted at a high philosophical-conceptual level. The dialogue was very specific.

"The real fabric of Soviet-Italian ties has always consisted of contacts between our countries' business circles, which have long-term agreements," N. Pagani went on to emphasize. "Italy is the Soviet Union's third largest Western trade partner (after the FRG and Finland). Trade between our states is constantly growing. Italy was one of the first Western countries to embark on establishing joint enterprises in the Soviet Union, and this is an exceptionally important instrument of fruitful cooperation.

"On the other hand, integration processes must be sensibly combined. The agreement recently signed between the EEC and CEMA is opening up prospects. Coordinating its actions with other Western partners, Italy is ready to develop cooperation with the Soviet Union further. There are some difficulties, of course, but the way is open.

"It is impossible not to see how Italians' interest in the Soviet Union has grown in recent years," N. Pagani continued. "Our parliamentary and cultural ties are growing stronger."

The Italian people's feelings of friendship, sympathy, and solidarity with the Soviet people were very strongly in evidence during the powerful earthquake which hit Armenia in December last year. Italy was one of the first Western countries to respond—in terms of promptness and in the volume of material aid sent to Armenia. This is what C. de Mita, chairman of the Italian Council of Ministers, said in this connection in his statement for IZVESTIYA:

"The Italian public has taken the devastation and loss of human life caused by the Armenian earthquake particularly to heart. Regardless of the differences in their political systems, the Italian people truly felt a sense of friendship for the Soviet people. I wish Armenia a speedy recovery, to which Italy will continue to contribute within its possibilities."

Saying farewell, Nazzareno Pagani asked me to convey warm wishes for success to IZVESTIYA readers. The world is becoming increasingly interdependent, and the struggle to overcome many difficulties transcends national boundaries. This is shown by the experience of relations between our countries.

Voronin Delegation Meets French Businessmen

LD1602042889 Moscow TASS in English 1804 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Text] Paris February 15 TASS—A Soviet delegation which has arrived here to attend the 23rd session of standing Soviet-French Commission for Scientific, Technological and Economic Cooperation had a meeting today with French business people.

Delegation leader Lev Voronin, a deputy Soviet prime minister, described the international situation, the perestroyka drive, economic changes in the USSR and specific Soviet proposals for brisker cooperation with France in economic, scientific and engineering fields.

The president of the French Bank for External Trade, Michel Freyche, has said that French business quarters are for broader economic cooperation with the Soviet Union and welcome positive changes in the Soviet economy.

Speaking in an interview with TASS correspondent Nikita Yermakov, Freyche, who is also a member of the National Council of French Business People, added that in their opinion, the Soviet Union should become more closely involved with international economic relations.

Asked about the extent to which Soviet-French contacts are impeded by Cocom bans on exports to socialist countries, he admitted that these bans are a serious drag on bigger trade, particularly in high-tech products.

UK Amendments Needed for War Crimes Trials

PM1502152589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Feb 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Krivopalov dispatch: "No Obstacle to Trial, Say Parliamentary Group Members Investigating War Crimes Cases"]

[Text] London—The parliamentary group investigating war crimes has published a report in London.

The document states that there are no major legal obstacles to the trial of people accused of major crimes during World War II. The blacklist of former Nazis runs to 250 people. In physical terms there are probably fewer: Some have died, some have left the United Kingdom....

Group Chairman Merlyn Rees, summing up the results of the work, stated that the British Government should follow the example set by Canada and Australia and make the necessary changes to legislation in order to conduct a judicial investigation into the cases of those suspected of war crimes.

IZVESTIYA has written about one of the criminals. He is Geches Antanas Getsevichyus, who lives in Edinburgh. For his mass reprisals against civilians he was awarded the Hitlerite Iron Cross.

I talked to him on the phone and asked him whether he still had his cross.

"No I don't. I haven't had it for a long time."

"But you did have a cross presented by the fascists?"

"That was such a long time ago...."

"Were you awarded one or not?"

"Yes I was. I got it for combat service on the eastern front."

"Combat service"... In 1941-1943 Commander A. Getsevichyus, 1st Platoon 2d Police Battalion, distinguished himself during atrocious reprisals against civilians and captured partisans in Kaunas, Minsk, and Slutsk. The KARIS newspaper published with the invaders' blessing printed a portrait of this master executioner wearing his cross.

The question naturally arises of just when the trials of Geches and his ilk could be held. Peter Archer, a prominent British legal expert, has said that he is convinced that war crimes trials could begin in London as little as 8 months after a government decision to act. It only takes political will.

The current situation is as follows: Sir Thomas Hetherington, former director of public prosecutions for England and Wales, and his colleague William Chalmers, who held a prominent position as a public prosecutor in Scotland until last April, have been instructed on behalf of the commission of independent legal experts to present Home Secretary D. Hurd with a report on the results of their investigation conducted in the USSR and Britain. They will conclude that there is sufficient evidence to warrant amending British legislation since none of the crimes were committed under British jurisdiction but exclusively on Soviet territory.

Home Secretary Hurd has previously categorically rejected the possibility of handing over these people to Soviet justice.

As for the conclusions of the parliamentary group, its report will give the group's consent to permitting such war crimes cases to be heard in the British courts, since the accusations being made—"genocide, murder, and manslaughter"—were considered crimes under international law and UK law at the time they were committed.

The USSR has shown itself a "trustworthy and cooperative" partner, supplying materials to other countries investigating war crimes, the report of the parliamentary group notes.

Finnish Diplomats Briefed on Estonian Reforms

PM1602083989 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 4 Feb 89 p 1

[ETA-attributed report by A. Prisyazhnyy: "To Develop Good-Neighborly Relations"]

[Excerpt] The visit to our republic by H. Talvitie, Finnish ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Soviet Union, and J. Kaurinkoski, Finnish consul general in Leningrad, continues.

V. Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, received the diplomats on 3 February.

"Recently we have seen that positive changes are taking place in the sphere of detente and humanizing the world community," Comrade Vyalyas said, opening the meeting. "M.S. Gorbachev's speech to the United Nations and the peace initiatives it contained received the international community's recognition. The Vienna meeting, which was the logical continuation of foreign policy in the 'Helsinki spirit,' introduced a life-giving impetus."

Then Comrade Vyalyas told his guests of the processes taking place in our republic. If we talk about a strong Soviet Union, we must also talk about strong republics. Not strong in the military sense, but in the economy, culture, and social policy. If the matter is examined from this viewpoint, then restructuring in Estonia is progressing well. Radical changes took place here recently. The republic's Communist Party heads the restructuring. The 11th Estonian Communist Party Central Committee's Plenum was critical for us. It was a difficult plenum, but we had to give an honest party assessment of the entire last period and plan how we should carry on living. The extensive economic policy of the stagnation period, denial of interethnic problems, and neglect of ecology led to serious negative processes. The party was not equal to the task.

In order to win the people's trust the party must have allies, Comrade Vyalyas continued. For us this is primarily the working people, the creative intelligentsia, scientists, and social movements. So the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium officially registered the Estonian People's Front. Dialogue is also under way with other public movements. The party does not have the same opinion as they in everything, but this is natural, since the truth emerges in debate.

Speaking about the preparation for the Central Committee plenum on the nationalities question, V. Vyalyas noted that sovereignty and independence for the republic are not possible without resolving fundamental questions: the introduction of regional economic accountability; constant attention to ecology; the further development of the national culture and language while not tolerating displays of discrimination toward other peoples; and vigorous foreign political activity by the republic and primarily close contacts with neighboring countries in the political, economic, and cultural spheres. These contacts are also needed so that people abroad can correctly understand restructuring in Estonia: Despite all its uniqueness, it is a united part of the restructuring process in the USSR. [passage omitted]

Political & Social

More on Industrial Workers' Moscow Meeting

Gorbachev's Opening Speech

PM1602103389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Feb 89 Second Edition pp 1-3

[TASS report: "Restructuring for the Working Class, the Working Class for Restructuring. Meeting at the CPSU Central Committee"; for Moscow Television reportage on this meeting see the 15 February Soviet Union DAILY REPORT pp 39-40]

[Excerpt] As already reported, a meeting with representatives of the working class was held at the CPSU Central Committee 14 February. Workers from many sectors of industry, construction, and transportation discussed a package of topical questions and problems of restructuring and reserves, and opportunities for boosting the effectiveness of creative work for our society's renewal.

While implementing revolutionary transformations for the sake of improving the people's life, the CPSU is closely heeding the opinion of the masses and the working class—of those who, through their labor, specific deeds, and social activeness, support and implement the historic program for the renewal of socialism.

Opening the meeting, M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, said:

On behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Soviet Government I cordially welcome you representatives of the working class. You have come here from the country's union republics, major regions, and industrial centers. I think that you have something to tell the party Central Committee.

Today, when restructuring has reached the wide open spaces, has taken the highway, and has affected the whole of society and all of us—at the center and at local level—we are facing many complex new problems. Look at the way democratic processes are developing, the forms glasnost is taking, the way the exchange of opinions is proceeding, the way economic life is shaping up at enterprises, the way processes are developing! The economic reform has embraced all enterprises; a quest is under way. Every enterprise is a unique and original organism, and matters must be conducted intelligently and sensibly, with due consideration for the real situation and for the difficulties and opportunities. None of this is easy.

The political reform is also unfolding. We are now in its first stage, which includes amendments to the Constitution and the new Law on Elections. There are so many innovations here! This is a totally new reality that we have never experienced before. We look, we scrutinize, we evaluate: Is everything fine, is everything working out the way we expected? Everything must be looked at, because it is a matter of the country's future. An important question for us is who will decide questions in the Supreme Soviet, and adopt new laws that reflect our present life and create preconditions to ensure that the process of restructuring gathers strength.

We conceived restructuring as the major direction of our work, as a revolutionary transition from the present state of society to a new one whereby man, his problems and his concerns, and his life would really be the center of our attention. Hence the new social policy and the creation of an atmosphere in which man can feel confident and free. Naturally, all these tasks can be solved only via man himself, via his stance. Restructuring will falter unless man himself becomes its main protagonist.

This is why we need the economic reform and reliance on labor collectives, and this is why we need the political reform, so as to involve working people at all levels of real power through democratic processes.

This is why we are developing democratization and glasnost—in order to improve our society's health, make it more humane, and get rid of all the accretions which previously encumbered our life. It is a matter of simple things—conscience, decency, conscientiousness, responsibility, comradeship, and consideration and concern for man. In other words, we are returning to the original values of October, the values put forward by the revolution more than 70 years ago. It is this that we are to talk about today. We in the CPSU Central Committee really need such a discussion.

Past experience has taught us a great deal. The progress of our restructuring may be criticized, it does have weaknesses, but in the main it is aimed at tasks and objectives which we all need. It is entirely geared to man. We would have been unable to formulate this policy if we had not had regular consultations and conversations with working people. We have, of course, always attached special importance to the opinion of the working class—the determining force of our society, the most numerous class and the one whose positions decisively determine the fate of any policy. The fact that the policy of restructuring has been accepted by the working class and by all working people cogently shows that we are on the right path.

People must be told the truth. There is a need for an open and honest exchange of opinion about the accumulated problems and processes occurring within society. It is as a result of sharp debates and exchanges of opinion, which are continuing to this day, that we have been able to reach the conclusions which form the basis of the policy of restructuring.

It is not easy to elaborate a correct policy, and I think that the party and society have managed to formulate such a policy. This is a great gain of the first stage of restructuring. But now there is a new task: This policy

must be implemented, and tremendous efforts will be required in the economic and social spheres, in labor collectives, and in the party.

We have more worries. If we want to live differently and scale new heights, we must also change our positions, our views, our attitude toward the cause, our methods of work. We must become different.

We have formulated the concept of a new life and we must make it a reality through our own efforts. We have no manuals at hand. But we do have the basic principles. We are in favor of socialism; we will strengthen and develop this system. We have faith in it. This is a working people's system. And so we are in favor of socialist ownership, of revealing the potential of the economy and the social system on the basis of socialist ownership. We are in favor of ensuring that power is really and truly in the working people's hands. We are in favor of broad democracy, responsibility, and discipline. These are the main criteria.

Voices can be heard casting doubts on these values of ours. In the party there is a firm opinion that such a position is unacceptable for us. And we know that we are firmly supported in this by the working class. Socialism is our system and we will stand up for it. This is the most important point, comrades.

Our country is vast, it is inhabited by a multitude of nations and ethnic groups and, in resolving the tasks of restructuring, we must always bear this in mind. Restructuring will help to solve many questions, including questions in the sphere of interethnic relations; it will help harmonize relations between peoples and republics and between people of all nationalities. If we recognize these main basic points, all the rest will be of secondary importance. We need time for decisive transformations; we must accumulate experience in restructuring. There will certainly be mistakes. We have problems inherited from the past, and we are also aware of our present omissions and shortcomings. This must also be discussed, comrades. This is perhaps the most important thing today. After all, we have evaluated the past and learned lessons from it; we are building the present policy bearing all this in mind. Now we must implement this policy with fewer losses and greater efficiency. It is necessary to march forward, to more decisively pursue the course of restructuring and economic and political reform, to impose order in the country, and to improve society's health. I would like you to speak out on these matters today.

Our task today is to listen to you. I invite you to a discussion, to an exchange of opinions. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Closing Speech

PM1602115189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Feb 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS account of closing speech by M.S. Gorbachev at 14 February meeting with "Representatives of the Country's Working Class" at the CPSU Central Committee]

[Text] A single meeting is surely not enough for us to exhaust all the problems which could form the subject of an interested and open discussion. From this I draw the following conclusion: Such meetings must become regular, including local trips, meetings at shops and enterprises, and a frank and in-depth discussion with workers and engineering and technical staff. The line of the CPSU Central Committee, the government, and the country's leadership of constantly and regularly exchanging opinions and consulting with the working class must not only not slacken but, on the contrary, must gain momentum. The more we become involved in restructuring and the more surprises and new questions it throws up, the greater the need for such contacts will be. Because only thus can one feel and appreciate how restructuring is progressing, how people feel, and what is going on, and grasp the urgent questions and problems requiring immediate thought and the adoption of measures.

Today's discussion convinces us of that once again. I thank you for this meeting and for the fact that you have come here not with speeches but with ideas, impressions, and moods. This is more important, comrades, than theses written in advance.

By the strictest criteria today's discussion was very meaningful. This is a great and important state discussion. Everything that you have said we are taking into account. Including the contentious questions because they stem from life and from workers' fervent concern for the country.

We used to use the words "the state" a lot. But at that time we often built cities and settlements in a slapdash fashion, whole regions died and became overgrown, rivers were spoiled, and so on. But what is a state? It is the republics, oblasts, cities, villages, collectives, and our families. If you understand the state in those terms that is correct. Therefore, everything discussed during this relaxed and open meeting may be called a great and important state discussion.

We take note of how you rate the present situation in the country. That is the first thing. The second is that many questions have been raised here which deserve our attention. Some are political and ideological and should be examined at the Politburo and the Central Committee. Others should be examined by the government, ministries, and departments. We will give the appropriate instructions. We will generalize today's discussion and try to take everything into account.

There are questions which demand thorough consideration. I do not think that you will suspect the present leadership of being deaf to people's needs and aspirations and to vital problems. Living conditions are difficult. In many cities and republics they must be improved and improved resolutely. To be blunt, if that were not the case there would be no need for restructuring. Life itself has brought us to restructuring and we have taken its path. We have given the most principled, open, and truthful evaluation of our entire past. Incidentally, that was our time, too, and we are also responsible for it. We are accountable for all that was good—the people worked and developed the country—and for the things that we overlooked, which the party's January Central Committee Plenum discussed forthrightly. Major omissions and mistakes in policy led to a deformation of socialism, resulted in great losses, seriously affected the fate of the country and society and people's living standards, and had an adverse effect on our entire life. We said all this and realized our responsibility.

We set out to learn the harshest and most exacting lessons from the past. Why did we do that? So as to decide how to live in the future, what path to take, and what to change in the political and economic systems.

We decided to discuss all this openly, according to the most rigorous yardsticks, the most rigorous assessments. We are reaching the conclusion that the revolution was not in vain, the people did not take power into their hands for nothing. Tremendous preconditions have been created for the further advancement of our society, despite the difficulties. And it must be said bluntly that the interest in socialism, the belief in socialism, the commitment to this system, the rejection of private property, the rejection of the exploitation of man by man—all these values of ours have become part of the flesh and blood of whole generations of Soviet people. And it is not only the working class which feels that way now but all working people. It is not the loudmouths and demagogues, not the various kinds of adventurists who determine our present and our future. We are strong enough to be able to endure them. Even though many of you today have said that it is time to use the laws, too.

Incidentally, we do have laws which envisage liability for kindling interethnic strife and for incitement to all kinds of disorders.

Democracy, comrades, always goes with responsibility, political culture, conscientiousness, honesty, and duty. It opens the way to people who are really concerned for the country and are committed to our cause, socialism, and our goals. Democracy is not for those who cannot steer a steady course and who try to put a wrench in the works of restructuring. The people have realized that people like that have nothing constructive to offer. They want to take us back to what we left behind through the revolution when we refashioned our world. Mistakes were made during those changes, but nonetheless we embarked on a road of great development. And the main thing for us now is to revive Lenin's concept of socialism.

Power to the working people, land to the peasants, peace to the peoples. All that remains. But look at how processes have developed. We eliminated private property but introduced systems of economic management which enhanced the power of the bureaucracy and alienated the worker from the means of production. Why was the revolution carried out? So that the worker would not only be master under the Constitution but would actually manage the state and would think and be concerned about how to exercise that power more effectively. Through reform, the lease, the contract, the self-management of the collective, and economic accountability we are restoring man to the status of master in production.

Exactly the same thing must be done to ensure that the peasant is master on the land. But he has been separated from the land and from nature, he has become a hired hand. Will there really be a steady harvest and good results on the land under this arrangement? No. At the forthcoming CPSU Central Committee Plenum on agrarian questions we are going to put forward major proposals.

Power. That was fully covered in the Constitution, our Constitution was and remains a progressive one. The soviets. These are organs which were produced by working people themselves yet here, too, man has been alienated from power. The political process has not run as it should. We must revive and restore the soviets and their real power. But deputies come along, they entreat, they beg: Help us, give us this, give us that. Deputies are elected by the people, they must determine local and regional policy and, at the top level, state policy and monitor the work of the executive organs.

Indeed, it is necessary to ensure that in the economic sphere the soviets are not beggars, that they have real power based on firm legal provisions. Thus it must be and thus it will be comrades. We want to revive the power of the soviets in full—in the political sphere, so that the main decisions are adopted, and in the economic sphere, so that the Soviets acquire real power, are based on real resources, and are able to resolve problems of local, regional, and republic significance. I want you to be convinced that all our thoughts and Leninist schemes will be embodied in real processes in the economy, democracy, and the spiritual sphere.

The process is proving difficult, comrades, very difficult. We are the children of our time. If it was only a question of bureaucrats, if only it were. But the bureaucrat also relies on the inertia of labor collectives and on the reluctance to change attitudes and change the forms of organization of work and life. His view is to leave everything as it was. But that cannot be tolerated. It has been firmly, clearly, and precisely said today, as is always the case when you meet with workers, that we cannot go

on living and working as we used to. Much must be changed if we do not want the country to lag behind. And the difficulties do not frighten us. Restructuring has revealed the accumulated problems. Mindful of this, we are elaborating measures to resolve them.

I welcome the main thing heard here: The workers favor restructuring. Many of you have expressed dissatisfaction with the fact that it is going slowly, that there are holdups, that some people are trying to put a wrench in the works and say that the Central Committee and government should see this and act resolutely. (Applause).

That is the main thing. The fact that you heated things up a bit for us here is also a good thing. It means that you believe us.

We are in the same boat, comrades. We all have an interest in ensuring that this colossal enterprise—our restructuring—should succeed. We have simply no option but to bend all our efforts to seeking success, for that is our destiny.

Look at what is happening in the country. The whole of society has been set in motion. You don't recognize the people! Everything has been set in motion and everything is changing. Restructuring is gathering momentum and the people and the workers are a showing greater sense of exactingness and principle. But there is another important thing: A firm stance must be adopted and there must be no giving way, no panicking or going into reverse, as it were. We cannot retreat, we cannot even halt. We must, on the contrary, advance more firmly.

We are at a crucial stage today. We have everything—both pluralism of opinions and glasnost—and economic accountability is being introduced, but the old instruction-based working methods are still there. And people are still in the process of overcoming the difficulties of this most taxing transitional period. Getting down to business is the most difficult time for us. And the fact that the working class is so solidly behind and supportive of restructuring and is working with increased efficiency and solving political and economic tasks more competently with every passing day—that, comrades, inspires us all. Together we will manage, irrespective of how difficult things may be.

The point is that the policy of restructuring has been accepted by the country. That is the main thing. The people will no longer allow anyone to fritter our work away. Restructuring treads on some people's toes, their grumbling and discontent are therefore understandable. This will put everything in its place, comrades. Restructuring is for the entire country, for the entire people, for every person. It is dictated by our great and future interests. Industry and the agrarian sector will be enhanced, the spheres of services, culture, and leisure will begin to develop—all this will produce new living conditions for the people. Restructuring will enter the sphere of international relations, and again that will be in our interests.

Now for cadres. Specialists and people with expertise are extremely needed by us. We need a qualitatively new body of cadres which grasps restructuring intellectually and emotionally and devotes all its knowledge to the cause of renewal. Where is our restructuring misfiring? Where is it malfunctioning? Indeed comrades here have already spoken about the correctness and timeliness of the decisions being made at the center. But somewhere en route to the labor collective they are so transformed that they are quite often devitalized and neutered. Some people are sitting it out and do not want changes. When I was in Leningrad I said that we should give everyone a chance. Give time for everything to be pondered and weighed up. We have given that chance, comrades. Almost 4 years have passed. We have sensed today that your patience is at the limit, that we sometimes show undue tolerance.

But let us think a bit: Who in the labor collective does the law entitle to solve all cadre problems? You. Where then is the labor collective council here? Assemble and decide. Incidentally, many are doing this. That's the way they are acting. I was told this, for example, at the Nadezhdinskiy metallurgical combine in Norilsk. The economic reform must be pushed forward more boldly, the cadre question will then be solved more quickly. What, for example, does a lease mean? It means a new deployment of cadres. At the plant, in the shops, at the team level. There are structures above the enterprises, and that is what the center should get to grips with. We will see this through, comrades.

There are cadres at the level of rayon, city, and so forth. Some people just plod their way through their alloted time at work and are content. They are well set up, so to speak. But we are carrying out a political reform; look, what kind of body of cadres and deputies is being formed as it progresses? It is already clear: Our soviets will be transformed. Yes, it will be tough for everyone, but the people will sort it out, find intelligent, worthy people, and appoint them.

Some people here have said: We selected fine leaders at our enterprises. And many could no doubt say the same. Indeed a fine body of people has already begun to be formed during these years. I think that it will continue to be so.

It was easier working by the old methods. Everything was worked out: Nomenklatura chucked out some and installed others. While restructuring itself makes crystal clear whom you should keep and whom you should replace. It reveals the people who can take a job on and do it. I well remember that previously in agriculture the turnover of kolkhoz and sovkhoz leaders over 5 years was 60-80 percent in some oblasts. And with what

result—did the work improve? No. Personnel replacement per se does not produce anything. You need skillful replacement based on how people have grasped restructuring and on how competent they are at assessing the situation in present day conditions and accepting new forms of labor and production organization and how they conduct themselves with people. These are questions which we must solve as part of the democratic processes in the sphere of both economics and politics.

Until, comrades, we ourselves solve the cadre problems in the labor collective councils with the help of the party organization and with the participation of trade unions, in our own way, in a socialist way, nothing will change. We have had enough of "pigs in pokes" being sent out to the rayons and oblasts. We will also undoubtedly nominate people from outside, that is normal. Where there is a good man, an experienced leader somewhere, he should not be rejected. But nevertheless people must decide for themselves.

Paradoxically enough, today it is not infrequently the specialists and leaders themselves who oppose progressive changes in the economy. Why is this? We discussed it in the Politburo. In recent years, when the specialists' pay has increased at kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and enterprises and, in addition, they also receive several extra payments a year for overfulfillment, all their problems appear to have been solved. After all, their wage is already set, guaranteed, not linked to the results of work. It does not provide an incentive for seeking new forms of economic management or scientific and technical solutions, for achieving higher labor productivity. With the introduction of, say, the lease system, the specialist will have more worries, but extra wages will depend on results.

Let intelligent, efficient specialists earn as much as is appropriate. Talent and knowledge must be valued, that is most important in any state. America buys up "brains" all over the world, it does not grudge spending money on that. We too should boost in every way the worth of the talented person, the person who really works for the people and devotes his efforts and knowledge to them. And we should provide material incentives. This is, incidentally, fully in accordance with the socialist principle: from each according to his ability, to each according to his labor. Let them earn. As long as things get moving. But at the moment they not infrequently earn money without really changing anything, while still acting in the old way. So this system is obsolete. That means that together we must think about this.

Some people say that now that farms and enterprises are going over to the lease system, let people themselves decide what wage rates to set for whom. People know everyone's income and contribution. True. There is just one question concerning social guarantees. It stems from the nature of our socialist system. There should be a state guarantee that a person will always have a minimum wage in every situation or turn of events. We must think about this and take it into account. We absolutely must have social protection of the working person. Just as we must have free medicine and free education. But as for wage rates, grades, piecework—all this must be looked at. We need not decide now, out of hand, at a stroke. When we have embarked on the lease system on a broad front, then we will master and understand much. Comrade Sysoyev, a lease operator driver, spoke here today. He told us about his wage scales. You have a leased truck, and whether you are on the third or the first grade, you work and do your job. And relations are entirely different. The standard of work, the input is different. All this requires consideration. And most importantly—we must not swing from one extreme to the other.

I think we will find the key to providing incentives for more energetic and effective actions by our cadres in implementing the reform. Our opinions coincide. Neither we, here at the center, nor you, representatives of labor collectives, are against people earning money—both leaders and the rank and file. But let it be on the basis of movement forward. On the basis of the new system of production relations, in which the working person himself will be the main protagonist.

Things will always be reliable and promising, comrades, if scientific and technical progress keeps pace with the new system of economic relations. Any progressive system misfires if it is not supported by scientific and technical progress. I regard as very important, for instance, the contribution of Yu.V. Skokov, general director of the "Kvant" Science-and-Production Association, and his fellow specialists to the association's affairs. They decided that every 4 years they should launch new output, new technology. Otherwise the enterprise's growth and its income will cease to grow and things will come to a standstill. These comrades have done great work. And I welcome this, and gave support to their initiative at the city party conference.

Unjustifiably little attention is paid to the topic of scientific and technical progress in our press, in the mass media. Yet this must be written and spoken about.

Today's discussion showed once again that at the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum we correctly defined and highlighted the vital, urgent tasks: housing, food, and goods. We will tackle this thoroughly. In the construction and housing program, it is necessary to take unconventional decisions on the basis of local initiative, on the basis of developing the base in the localities. We will now find that everything is held up because of construction materials, the construction base. This is already clear. This is the critical point. We must overcome this situation, overcome it by freeing people's initiative through methods based on local resources [khozyaystvennyy sposob].

As for small enterprises, pool your efforts, pool your resources—act together. Only thus, comrades, by working together as a whole people, can this problem be tackled. Kazakhstan, Orel and Lipetsk Oblasts, and other regions have shown that it is possible.

Our consumer market is in a strained situation. A huge volume of money is in circulation. We must increase the commodity supply, food, and industrial output. And especially, develop the service sphere. Formerly no attention was paid to this sphere. We used to try to resolve the problem of balancing the market by means of alcohol products, imports, increased prices for furs and gold, but all this was wrong. Now we have taken the correct course—that of creating a base for the production of goods, a large-scale, up-to-date base of our own. Reequipping light, food, and processing industry, boosting agriculture and the service sphere. Here the potential is boundless, and we will actively seek approaches and solutions. As early as this year we should achieve a significant increase in goods.

In our situation, comrades, there are also manifestations of group, selfish interests. The press has begun to raise these questions. And it is right to do so. Yes, some people think: I made a packet today, good, there will be another tomorrow. I managed to cut the cheap output, get rid of it, even if people need it, and I'm pleased. No, that is your loss, comrades. It boomerangs on you yourself in the end—through the store, through the counter, through the workshop, and so forth. Therefore increasing the production of consumer goods and developing the service sphere is our common task. Everyone should tackle it. That is a real state-minded approach. And the working class should monitor all this. Just as the working class should keep an eye on questions of distribution. We are going to finalize the question of workers' control, we are to draft a document giving powers to workers' control, so that this form becomes effective, because we have bred a lot of rogues.

And this too is an urgent task, you rightly noted that there must be more toughness here, the laws must be effective. We must step up the struggle against all negative phenomena and criminal elements, against those who lift their hands against the individual and against property, personal or state; those who cheat, swindle, scrounge. We must wage an aggressive and resolute struggle.

Restructuring started by raising questions and problems, by exposing them. We will continue to learn about our society, study the roots of the phenomena that worry us. But, comrades, restructuring will take place, will achieve success, if the formulation of problems, the analysis, is followed by constructive, difficult, vigorous, energetic work.

I must repeat: Some workers and entire collectives, and, indeed, some press organs are stuck at the rallying stage. We make a lot of noise, brothers, a lot of noise, and we have already made enough noise about some things. We have accumulated plenty of blunders of our own, blunders from the years of restructuring. Therefore we must now place the emphasis on really practical work—now is the time for practical work, that should be the focus of attention for labor collectives, management organs, party organs, and the mass media.

I think the observations about our press were correct. This should be the principle here: Maintain the critical approach to our work, to the past, and resolve every issue publicly. But there is debate and debate. What are these debates about a multiparty system, for instance? They are groundless. After all, even with three or four parties, it is possible to maintain such diktat that no one dares make a sound, no one can breathe freely! It is important for the atmosphere in society to be democratic, for democratic institutions to operate, for the people really to be able to take decisions, monitor affairs, and criticize. The democratization of public life, state life, glasnost—that is the main thing. The party will resolutely follow this path, it will use all its authority to support these processes. That means that within the framework of democracy we should defend our values, rebuff those who hamper us, who put forward all kinds of far-fetched, dubious ideas. The people who do this are irresponsible, theoretically and politically bankrupt.

Our party has great potential. It has demonstrated its strength and maturity. It is a party capable of withstanding every test, assuming responsibility for everything that has happened and is happening in the country. It proposed a policy that accords with vital nationwide aspirations and interests, and will uphold this policy. And we hope, comrades, for the effective support of the working class. It is their party, it pursues and will pursue their ideology. We will discard and overcome all the distortions that occurred in the past. You are keenly concerned—the present meeting has shown this—for the fate of the party, the fate of the country, the fate of socialism. Quite right. It is your party. It is our party! (Applause.)

I wish you all success, I wish you success in upholding firmly the position of the working class. Without a firm and resolute working class position, we will simply be unable to resolve the historic tasks of restructuring. That is the main thing. No policy is worth anything unless it is supported and realized by the working class. We see, we sense such support. We will not deviate from the course outlined. And today's meeting has inspired us still more, strengthened us in this.

All the best to you!

Working Group Meets on Union-Republic Powers

PM1502103189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Feb 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Session of Deputies' Group"]

[Text] The working group of deputies, formed by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet (parliament) to draft proposals on the division of powers between the USSR and the republics, held a regular meeting in the Kremlin on 15 February.

The meeting was chaired by the group's leader Georgiy Tarazevich, vice-president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and president of the Presidium of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet.

The working group examined tentative proposals on delimiting the powers of the union and its republics, prepared by its editorial commission with the participation of scientists and experts.

The proposals reflected the opinion of the presidiums of the supreme soviets in the constituent republics, which submitted their suggestions on this issue.

The deputies who took part in the deliberations—Yu.N. Yelchenko, V.A. Protsenko, I.A. Karimov, A.G. Babayev, R.A. Kukayn, M.K. Arutyunyan, A. Dzhumagulov, V.I. Kazakov, Kh.A. Rayk, and K.A. Khalilov—focused their attention on issues of expanding the rights of the union republics and specifying lines of delimitation in distributing the powers between the USSR and the republics.

Many speakers approved the idea of endorsing in the USSR Constitution the following principle: Each republic has the right to resolve all issues that are not described as being within the competence of the union by the Constitution and laws of the USSR.

They stressed the need for stronger guarantees of the rights of the republics in managing and using natural resources—public property, wealth of the entire Soviet people, and in elaborating legal mechanisms for settling possible differences in considering specific issues of environmental protection, health service, public education and so on.

The deputies assigned the editorial commission, with the participation of scientists and specialists, to continue the elaboration of proposals on the division of powers between the USSR and its constituent republics in the economic, social and cultural, and state-legal structure spheres on the basis of the materials submitted by the union republics and research institutions and the results of the discussion held at the meeting.

The next meeting of the working group is slated for the second half of March.

Senior workers from the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers took part in the work of the session.

Gorbachev, Medvedev Attend Soiree for Artist

LD1502230589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Feb 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] A creative soiree is taking place today in the conservatory grand hall in honor of Yevgeniy Svetlanov, people's artist of the USSR, Hero of Socialist Labor, a Lenin Prize laureat. It is devoted to his 60th birthday. [passage omitted]

Present at the soiree were Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev with his wife, and Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev with his wife. [video shows Gorbachev and Raisa taking part in ovation]

More on People's Deputies Election Campaign

PRAVDA Editorial

PM1502164989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Feb 89 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Responsibility to the Voters"]

[Text] The okrug election meeting in Moscow's Leninskiy territorial electoral okrug No 1 went on long after midnight while its participants chose 2 of the 13 contenders.

It took 14 hours to determine the names of the candidate deputies at electoral okrug No 345 in Yaroslavl.

Reports are coming in from remote Siberia: The dispute as to whose names were to be put on the ballot papers continued until the morning....

Our country has never seen this kind of election campaign. At the beginning of December when election day was named, even the most fervent optimists would not perhaps have dared predict such a powerful upsurge in public activeness, and today this is undoubtedly the main factor determining the entire political atmosphere in the country.

Contrary to people who, prior to its adoption, deemed the new Law on the Election of USSR People's Deputies insufficiently democratic, all strata have gotten moving. Painful problems and ways of resolving them are being discussed frankly and in an interested fashion. By taking part in practically nominating candidates and by collectively evaluating their positions and arguments, millions of people have thus become involved in practice in implementing the political reform and in bringing its main idea—sovereignty for the people—to fruition.

It was citizens' social activeness and responsibility and their effective and enterprising participation in restructuring that were the pivotal ideas in the party's election platform. The CPSU Central Committee Appeal to the Party and the Soviet People says that we can only achieve the common goals by combined efforts. The results of the first phases of the election campaign show that the CPSU platform has created a reliable basis for this unification reflecting the people's most vital aspirations.

The CPSU platform and the party's entire socioeconomic policy is based on a desire to ensure that life begins to be better for our people in the next few years. So the primary tasks include resolving the food problem, creating sufficient stocks of high-quality industrial goods in the stores, and meeting every Soviet family's housing requirements. "We have already proclaimed these tasks

and slogans on several occasions," engineer V. Zagoruyko from Kharkov wrote to PRAVDA, "but this is the first time that they have been backed up by such a clear and realistic program of economic, investment, and scientific and technical measures. This is the first time that the economy has in fact oriented itself toward people."

Whether we are talking about prosperity for people who have retired for a well-deserved rest, social aid for families, a radical improvement in the population's medical services, or the improvement and conservation of the environment—this is all a sphere of urgent concern for the party, which is dependent in everything on the will of the people, and is mobilizing all society's intellectual potential in order to achieve the aims outlined. The candidates whose professional and public work and civic stance convince the voters of their devotion to these aims receive the most support among the masses.

It is understandable that mistakes are inevitable in our democratic "self-education." In some cases, people strain their vocal chords arguing the merits of a particular nominee. In others, after losing an open and honest fight, they try to influence the result with mass letters and telegrams to high-ranking organs and to the mass media. Labels and unwarranted accusations against one's opponents are also brought into play. The worst thing, of course, is if someone's personal ambitions and narrow egoistic or group interests intervene in the struggle for the mandate of people's deputy—it is then as a rule that democracy is sacrificed to demagoguery, unscrupulous methods appear, and attempts are made to exert pressure on public opinion. Broad glasnost, open polemics, and faultless adherence to the spirit and letter of the law are the best antidotes here.

It must be admitted, however, that not all party and soviet organs have proved ready for the new realities of election work. Devotion to former stereotypes, timidity when faced with irregular situations, and inability to convince and lead people have made themselves felt in a number of areas. Where are the most characteristic miscalculations, judging by the editorial mailbag and PRAVDA correspondents' reports? Above all, in some areas prohibitive methods still prevail in the arsenal of local soviet and electoral okrug commissions. They should be delighted at the increase in people's activeness and satisfy their desire to hold election meetings in collectives or in places of residence, and promote the considered and precise observance of the law's statutes. But instead you sometimes encounter a refusal to provide premises and various obstacles in organizing these meetings.

It is well known that the law grants okrug electoral commissions and election meetings broad independence on procedural questions. But there are cases where this freedom is only regarded as a means for simplifying procedure—to hold open rather than secret ballots, reduce the number of candidates submitted for registration, and so on, which arouses just dissatisfaction in the voters. But what is the point of attempts to exert pressure on "superfluous" candidates to induce them to withdraw? It must be bluntly stated that everything that restricts democracy and wittingly or unwittingly bars a man from participating in political life and in exercising power contravenes the party's election platform and its course of restructuring.

Candidates are now submitting their programs—this is a novel and gratifying phenomenon in our life. People ponder and then make concrete proposals. One thing is indisputable—programs must be realistic and practicable. But voters are being promised almost "mountains of gold." They suddenly find out that one contender is promising to secure compete ecological cleanliness at enterprises in their okrug within 3 years (!), while another intends to "increase procurements of imported industrial goods prior to the appearance of Soviet goods of the same quality" (but he is quiet about when the latter will appear and from where). Some people are urging the immediate introduction of the convertible ruble, evidently without taking into account our multibillion financial deficit, and some people are demanding that all state apartments be sold to their owners, forgetting to inquire as to whether this is what they want or whether they have the means....

A great deal in these programs still stems from political naivete and lack of elementary information and practical administrative experience.... This can all be overcome and rectified—where's there's a will, as they say. It is another matter when some candidate is overcome by ambition and harebrained schemes. This stance achieves nothing apart from wasted efforts, funds, human energy, and state resources. "Success" can be "grabbed" by juggling promises to provide painless solutions to social ailments, but it will not be long before payment for the people's trust becomes due. No one has the right to forget this responsibility—scientists, writers, party workers, or economic leaders.

The CPSU election platform expresses nationwide interests. This is a document of tremendous persuasive force combining breadth in the range of outlined aims, realism in determining ways to achieve them, consistency in implementing political, economic, and social reforms, and the newness of the pressing tasks set by the time itself, the affirmation of party prestige, the revival of sovereignty for the soviets, and scope for developing all forms of democratic self-government for the people. It is no coincidence that public organizations' election programs, while aligned with the CPSU platform in the main respects, have defined the most diverse priorities for their future deputies' efforts. By agreeing to stand as candidates from these organizations, the candidates have thus confirmed their devotion to the aforementioned priorities. At the same time you get the impression that some Communists nominated as candidate deputies have forgotten the general party platform: They

don't explain its essence and substance to the masses, and they don't correlate their personal programs with its provisions—and in some cases they even diverge from it....

The period of okrug election meetings is coming to a close and the registration of candidates is nearly over. A new and crucial phase in the election campaign—competitive struggle for deputies' seats—has begun. Admittedly a number of okrugs have only nominated or registered one candidate, but this does not mean that he is "fated" to succeed: The right to be a people's deputy should be confirmed by one's daily labor, relations with people, and ability to stir them to real action.

While carrying out agitation work among the masses, party committees are not entitled to display smugness and complacency or cede the initiative that is being eagerly seized by people who are sometimes able to finance "their" candidate's campaign more heavily. The realization that the election struggle is responsible political work, requiring every Communist's active participation and party organizations' ideological cohesion, must be restored within the party.

"Large-scale measures and progressive reforms," the CPSU Central Committee Appeal says, "must be backed up by responsibility from every one, by conscious discipline and a creative attitude." The party platform unites all healthy forces in our society today, and consolidates all social strata, all nations and ethnic groups. The coming elections must be not only a victory for particular leaders but also a victory for our restructuring.

*Lithuanian Nomination Process

WA18000528 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 11 Feb 89 p 1

[Article by R. Motskus (Vilnius): "Let Us Leave the Old Customs"]

[Text] One must say at the outset that the pre-election campaign has never seen such enthusiasm, such civic activity in Lithuania in the present stage of her history.

A couple of days ago district election commissions began to register candidates for USSR people's deputies and will be doing so until 23 February. A total of 234 people in the republic are running for 42 deputy positions. There are many candidates. So far I have found only one district which has nominated only two candidates.

The press, television, and radio report daily on the course of the campaign. Every bit of unevenness, the slightest violation of the spirit and the letter of the law on elections causes a sharp reaction.

"In our lower-level collectives the debates began even when determining the delegates for the general plant conference for nominating candidates for deputies," says the secretary of the shop party organization of the Panevezh Ekranas Plant, V. Palis. "And these discussions took place at the conference itself! The people are developing a taste for democracy. I believe that on 26 March we shall have real elections and not mechanical ones as was the case in the past, which amounted to merely dropping ballots in a jar."

Communists and all citizens have taken very seriously the appeal of the CPSU Central Committee and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania which called them to vote for those who are capable of actually achieving progress in all spheres of social and economic life, for those who will be able to justify the confidence of the people not in words, but in deeds. They are also actively discussing the proposals in the local press from the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee to the forthcoming plenum of the CPSU Central Committee concerning improvement of international relations in the USSR. These issues are very crucial in the republic.

What are the candidates like who were nominated without the notorious schedule of allocations? Party and soviet workers make up almost one-fourth of the candidates. There are almost as many leaders of enterprises, plants, and organizations. About 18 percent are scholars and VUZ instructors, 13 percent are kolkhoz workers (mainly kolkhoz chairmen), and 9 percent are writers and journalists. Eighty-six percent of those who were nominated are members and candidate members of the CPSU. These figures tell us so much about the political activity of these categories of the population. But there are also alarm "bells" which were not heard during the period when there were schedules of allocations. For instance, among the candidates there are only eight women and very few workers.

It is difficult to say in advance how many candidates will remain on the list when the district meetings are held and the registration is completed. The voters do not have a unanimous opinion yet. Some are inclined to have two or at most three candidates on the ballot. Others advise in favor of having elections in stages, according to the so-called "French system." For instance, in the first round the list for voting includes all candidates who have been nominated, and the second round includes only the two who have received the most votes.

There are many in favor of elections in stages in those districts where there are many candidates for one position. For example, in Tauragskiy territorial district No 693 they have nominated 18 candidates, in Ukmergskiy national territorial okrug No 252—14, and in Radvilishkskiy No 247—13.

What next? Of course the new electoral law allows such elections. It is another matter whether or not it is possible to attract people to such an election marathon when it will be necessary to have a second or even a third

round of voting. After all, an election campaign is costly. In Lithuania alone, the elections of 42 USSR people's deputies will cost 2 million rubles.

As the practice of recent days shows, many candidates, having realistically evaluated their capabilities, are refusing to participate in the conference. For example, in that same Tauragskiy district, only two of the 18 nominees agreed to be candidates and were registered by the election commission. But there are also districts that have issued certificates to 6-8 candidates for one deputy position.

Recently in the republic there was a kind of rehearsal of the forthcoming measure. In January there were elections of five deputies to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet to replace those who had retired. They tried out the new devices for the political battle and the organization of the campaign. In Shyaulyay, for example, two candidates conducted a debate before the voters and answered questions. These debates were shown on television. Instead of the standard, irritating biographies that used to be posted all over the city, there have appeared nice posters, portraits, and slogans that express the essence of each candidate's program. Without fear of being reproached for "fishing" for votes, one of the candidates even sent each voting family a New Year's card, and visited their apartments on their days off—a conversation in the home is always more cordial than an official one.

In the republic and local press there have appeared articles and interviews giving the political portraits and programs of the candidates. To be sure, there have also been some improper attacks. But, curiously, they have frequently had the opposite effect from what was intended, tipping the scales in the direction of the "offended" competitor. There has also been this kind of incident: During the night the portraits of one candidate have been pasted over by the "team" of the other. Such incidents have been condemned by the electoral commissions.

These elections served as a good lesson for the voters as well. Many have not mastered the voting procedure—either they come to the polling place without a passport or, even worse, they authorize one of their relatives to vote for the whole family and sometimes even for the whole section of the apartment building. Or, for instance, certain people do not know what to do with the ballots, for example how to correctly underline the name of the person you want, how to complain about the actions of the electoral commissions, how to obtain permission to observe the counting of the votes, and so forth. Thus many of the people you meet express a desire to have the procedural questions having to do with the forthcoming elections to USSR people's deputies explained on television and radio and in the press, as was done for the USSR census just before it was taken.

Yesterday, while riding through the streets of Vilnius, I met several Zhigulis [car make] that had written on them appeals to vote for one candidate or another. These were apparently proponents or representatives of one of the candidates. The question immediately came up on Lithuanian television: Is such a thing permitted? This was the answer: Go ahead and use this form of advertising, but do not cover up the windows, for this will restrict your view and make traffic unsafe. I have even met a poet who has composed a quatrain in honor of his candidate. I have heard that they are preparing to cross swords with the caricaturist agitators. Well, any legal means are good if they help us to elect the most worthy candidates to be people's deputies.

Ukraine's Draft Restructuring Program Reviewed

AU1502174189 Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAINA in Ukrainian 7 Feb 89 p 2

[V. Desyatnykov article: "To Think It Over Once More?—Notes from a Meeting of Kiev Writers' Organization"]

[Text] On that day, the atmosphere in the hall of the republic's Motion Picture House was—let me say it straight—tense. An initiating group, formed by representatives of the Kiev writers' organization and of the collective of the T.H. Shevchenko Literary Institute, presented to the audience for examination a draft program of the Ukrainian People's Movement for Restructuring, and an appeal issued to the republic's population on the occasion of the establishment of this organization. The documents were read. One after another, the speakers took the floor, for the most part to approve what they had heard and to rebuff those who voiced some doubts or who wanted to make some draft clauses more precise or rephrase them. Now and again, the audience shouted "lethargy" and "shame" at speakers of this kind; such speeches were interrupted by applause or the stamping of feet.

At such moments, the author of these notes was reminded of a session of the "Heritage" club he attended. The session discussed the attitude that one ought to have toward M. Hrushevskyy's political activity and scientific research. People got up on the podium, but were unable to speak. Most of the people who rallied at the "Heritage" session did not want to listen to the facts and reasoning of "the other side." More precisely, they did not accept and were unwilling to accept any well-considered, sober assessments. It was that kind of discussion.

I am far from making any comparison. After all, the audience at the meeting under review was different. These were figures that were well-known to the people, wise masters in belles lettres. They were novelists, poets, columnists, and critics, whose works had been actively engaged in restructuring. Moreover, these were honest and principled people, whom we have become accustomed to trust, and who inspire sincere respect. And yet the atmosphere in the hall brought bad recollections to my mind.

The pathos on the part of many speakers was understandable. We know that disproportionate progress has been made in restructuring. Having reached remote areas, the waves of restructuring die down and become a glass-like surface. Some speakers even asserted that our entire republic was something that resembled a preserve of stagnation. But here is a detail to refute this idea. It was precisely Ukrainian television that broadcast an ample report on the session to which these notes are dedicated. It carried virtually all the speeches, and almost unabridged. In any case, if there were any abridgments, they were of a purely technical character. We were able to listen to the sharpest utterances, and mass listener and reader from the masses could compare the statements with the broadcast comments. The debate was open. And this was wonderful. It was good that everyone had an opportunity to listen to P. Osadchuk, O. Musiyenko, S. Telnyuk, R. Ivanchenko, S. Plachynda, V. Yavorivsky—to all those who defended the draft program of the Ukrainian People's Movement. It was good that passionate speeches delivered by D. Pavlychko, I. Drach, Yu. Mushketyk, and Yu. Shcherbyna reached every one. It was good that every one of us was able to comprehend what they were upset about, what they were standing and fighting for. Television also showed that not everything was smooth, that there was a sharp clash between ideas, principles, and attitudes, that irresponsibility was countered by a profound realization of what the documents were and what they might turn into, and the aspiration to stir up passions and emotions was countered by a calm and well-balanced attitude.

There were various speeches, but what impressed me most was the earnest tone of Yu. Shcherbak's speech. While speaking about the aforesaid draft documents, the latter was probably the first from the audience to note the need for a more responsible attitude. There are, he said, political realities that must not be disregarded. We are making history, and any haste is inopportune. We must not overlook the fact that the documents under examination will be looked at with all sorts of eyes, including hostile ones, and that they will not be able to avoid all sorts of opinions. In Yu. Shcherbak's opinion—and it is difficult to disagree with it—the drawback of the draft program and appeal lies in the fact that, as political documents, they go into too much detail, and that they were worked out without the participation of specialists: qualified lawyers, economists, historians, and political scientists. To some extent, this explains the fact that in the documents—and this is my opinion—there is a great deal of spontaneity and dilettantism. And if this is so, the procedure for the discussion on the drafts also has an air of dilettantism. Why, for example, were the documents not copied, multiplied, and distributed among the audience? Was it not clear that to perceive something spoken, using only one's hearing (and the reading took some 90 minutes) is one thing, and that to have the text in hand and to be able to see and think over every phrase is something quite different? Was is possible to do things in a different way? Well, this proved to be possible.

No wonder that when L. Kravchuk, chief of the Ideological Department in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, sharply criticized a number of principled theses set forth in the documents under review, no one was able to challenge him in a well-substantiated manner. The point was, on the one hand, that the majority only heard the drafts, heard them "as a whole," and for the most part in an emotional way. But on the other hand, and this is the most important thing, it was difficult to contradict L. Kravchuk in essence. The documents, as they were presented, were rough copies that turned out to contain many contradictions and unconsidered theses.

What theses precisely? L. Kravchuk noted in particular the following. Point 4 of the draft program chapter entitled "The General Principles" says that the People's Movement organizes its activity in conformity with the constitutions of the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR. At the same time, the program contains a number of theses that contradict this postulate. Contrary to Article 2 of the USSR Constitution and Article 2 of the Ukrainian SSR Constitution, which establish that all state organs are under the control of and accountable to the soviets of people's deputies—that is, to elective organs of state power—the program of the Ukrainian People's Movement sets itself the objective of ensuring mutual control among the legislative, executive, and judicial powers. In the opinion of the drafters, it is precisely the Ukrainian People's Movement—and not the CPSU or the soviets of people's deputies that are elected at all levels on the basis of free and democratic elections—that "has to become a real" (as distinguished from the unreal ones?—V.D.) "mouthpiece for the one single will of the Ukrainian people, for people belonging to other ethnic groups living in the Ukraine, and for the interests of Ukrainians living beyond our republic." The authors of the program say that the constitutional principle of universal state ownership of the land, air, water, natural resources, and means of production is "inhuman and antisocialist in essence." Why? On what grounds?

The meeting noted the need to change all-people's ownership into ownership by the republic. Why? On what grounds? In general, in the opinion of the draft authors, insofar as the state is concerned it should be merely "a council of delegates commissioned to administer the people's property." Esteemed readers, in this verbal nebula do you not perceive some elements drawn from Rousseau and from other old humanist thinkers, the forerunners of Marx? So what is wrong about that? But since those times, social thought has advanced very far, and we have risen to a significantly higher level in comprehending social realities; what we see in this case is a generous descent, virtually to the origins of this thought.

This far from complete list of anticonstitutional theses set forth in the program, L. Kravchuk said, is evidence that, while alleging the movement's conformity with the constitutions of the USSR and the Republic, the authors

actually renounced the principle declared by themselves. L. Kravchuk also had serious reservations about the chapter devoted to interethnic relations. One of the most topical issues on the fringe of interethnic relations is granting Ukrainian the status of an official state language. This problem is being settled. On 27 January 1989 the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium adopted the decision to work out draft amendments to the Ukrainian SSR Constitution and a law on the language. Therefore, the problem under consideration is not simple and is highly important. Moreover, it is obvious that legislative acts in general, and in this case in particular, are only the point of departure for complex and responsible work that is still expected to settle countless complex problems. It is obvious that in our multinational republic we have to be attentive and sensitive in taking into account the legitimate interests of representatives of every nation and nationality living in the Ukraine. Any pressure must be ruled out. The Ukraine has to be a good mother to all who live here.

However, the draft program goes against the present valid right to freely choose the language in which children are to be taught at school. Is this democratic? Is it fair? Are we supposed to incorporate people into the Ukrainian language against common sense, disregarding reality and the wishes of those concerned? Last but not least, this attitude absolutely diverges from the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th party conference.

Yu. Mushketik was absolutely right when he said at the meeting that the issue of selecting the language was an issue of principled importance. But how did he pose the issue himself? Here is what he said: "We shall fight against this law" (that is, against the principle of free will—V.D.), "we shall fight resolutely. It was the pragmatic bourgeoisie who have taken advantage of this law." This was the way things were turned around. In school, it is sufficient to opt for Russian, or for any other language that is not Ukrainian, to be blacklisted as bourgeois, as a person of inferior class. Well, Yuriy Mykhaylovych, let us see what Lenin has to say: "The only thing we do not want is the element of compulsion. We do not want to use a stick to drive people into paradise." This also applies to the language problem. And Lenin continued: "Compulsion (stick) will produce a million new frictions, misunderstandings, and so forth." I can see what you mean, Yuriy Mykhaylovych. You mean that the attitude assumed at present by many people has been shaped along certain guidelines for decades, and that this attitude has many other fine features and shades. But let us be patient. Let us set about re-educating, about propagating the Ukrainian language—this is the right way.

There are also quite a few unacceptable theses in the appeal, L. Kravchuk pointed out. The reform of the Soviet political system is a matter of everyone's concern. This is right. However, here is a thesis set forth in the appeal: "The system will not change by itself; it has to be broken by us, the rank and file citizens of our great country." How are we going to break it? How will we destroy the system? Will we apply force, or perhaps other means? Proceeding from certain real economic problems, the drafters of the appeal and the program time and again deviate to incitement. They accuse the "center," Moscow, of having allegedly intentionally poisoned the Ukraine's soil, water, and air, and of polluting the republic with radiation. No matter how sorry we are about the destroyed environment, and how clearly we can see the dangerous brink to which we have been closely drawn in ecological matters, is it possible to cast such irresponsible accusations? I repeat that many, and virtually all, of the shortcomings and plights listed in the ecological part of the draft documents really exist. We all are sorry about this. This motivates us to take immediate action, but are we really going to fight those who sit in the "center" who consciously pollute?

We are aware that the progress made in restructuring has been difficult. We know that restructuring is met by opposition. It has not been welcomed and accepted by everybody. But is it true, as some people alleged at the meeting, that restructuring has stopped at the Mykhaylivskyy farmstead, that is, at the point at which the RSFSR ends and our Republic begins? The writer of these notes has just visited the "Konveyer" association in Lvov, and is in a position to attest to the fact that many marked successes have been scored by this collective, which has switched over to leasing and whose members are shareholders at the enterprise, based on the principles of restructuring. My colleagues at the editorial board quoted many similar facts in their reports on the recent rayon, city, and oblast party conferences. We know that a program is now being implemented to perfect interethnic relations in the republic. Some progress has been made in promoting glasnost, and our historians have vigorously set about eliminating the so-called "blank spots." Even bearing in mind these facts alone, is it possible to assert that restructuring in our republic has come to a standstill? It continues, although not as fast as we would like it to. Moreover, as L. Kravchuk correctly pointed out, a nihilist attitude assumed in evaluating the restructuring process offends the Republic's workers' class, peasantry, and all who selflessly work to promote new things.

Since we are speaking about the workers' class and the peasantry, let me add one more point. Have the drafters of the Program for the Ukrainian People's Movement and of the appeal advised these people at least in some way? They have not. Was this right? The drafts have not been discussed in any labor collective and the working people have not seen them. This was perhaps another reason why these documents have missed the chance to be attributed to people. They have thus far attested to certain ambitions of their authors whose goal is, and let us call things by their proper names, to create, contrary to the declared loyalty, structures based on confrontational positions. The question that arises is this: Is the

movement to be a socialist and internationalist structure, or not? Hence another point is noted at the meeting: Is there room for Communists in the movement? Therefore, all this is worth our pondering once again.

Armenian Power Unit Calls for Lowered Consumption
NC1602055389 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0523 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Text] Attention: The Armenian Power Production Unit [words indistinct] has decided that today, 15 February, between 1800 and 2300, all the enterprises of the republic must curtail power consumption by the first and second [word indistinct].

Yerevan Commandant Reports Violations, Arrests
NC1502222789 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0525 GMT 15 Feb 89

[From the review of SOVETAKAN AYASTAN]

[Text] As always, the statement by the military commandant of the special district is published on the paper's last page. The statement reads: The situation in the republic's capital and in those areas where the hours of curfew are in effect is under the full supervision of the troops and organs of the Interior Ministry. On 14 February (?50) people were detained and 21 cars impounded for violating the curfew and for failing to produce identity cards and identification documents.

[Words indistinct] situation. Fourteen people were detained and [number indistinct] cars were impounded for violating the curfew in those areas of the republic where the curfew is in effect. No crimes have occurred in connection with carrying out the requirements of the curfew hours.

Baku Commandant Reports Violations, Arrests
NC1402181989 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 14 Feb 89

[Notice by Lieutenant General Kolesnikov, military commandant of the Baku City Special District, issued 14 February]

[Text] There has been no major change in the situation in the city during the day. The internal affairs organs continue to take measures to (?obstruct) any action that would violate the laws.

According to the Baku City Internal Affairs Administration, criminal charges have been brought against [words indistinct]. Regrettably, violations of the laws [words indistinct] are (?creating unease).

(?Emin Yilmaz Islam oglu) and [name indistinct], students at the Vocational and Technical Training School No 2, and [name indistinct], a student at [word indistinct] secondary school, have been arrested by the Shaumyanovskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Department and brought to account for robbing transport vehicles in a number of the city districts. An investigation has been launched [words indistinct].

[Signed] Lieutenant General Kolesnikov, military commandant of the Baku City Special District.

Lithuanian Scholars Consider National Day
LD1502164589 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 11 Feb 89

["Events and Views" program presented by Vilnius radio correspondents Izolda Malyte and Vladas Dobilas]

[Excerpts] The subject of our talk is 16th February. This date has received diametrical opposite evaluations at various times in this country since 1918 when the independence of Lithuania was proclaimed.

To give you an idea of those flows and ebbs here is what the Encyclopedia of Soviet Lithuania published in 1986 says about the Act of Independence made by the Lithuanian Council 71 years ago: The statehood of Lithuania was not restored by the act. The occupationist regime continued ruling the country while the Lithuanian Council had no power at all. By that act the Lithuanian bourgeoisie suppressed the growing revolutionary movement of the people.

By way of comparison here is what historian Alfonsas Eidintas says about the document and its significance—Alfonsas Eidintas is assistant director of the History Institute of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences. The recording was made a few days ago this year. Here is historian A. Eidintas:

[Begin Eidintas recording in Lithuanian with superimposed English translation] Skeptics say that the act of 16th February did not specify the state system of the Lithuanian Republic. But we know very well that the danger of monarchy was always looming like a shadow. Therefore, the Independence Act had a highly diplomatic wording; it said that the state system was to be fixed by democratically elected inaugural Seimas. [passage omitted]

While last February a look at Vilnius and other major cities of Lithuania might have suggested the idea of a curfew with militia patrols everywhere, this year 16th February has been given the status of an official national holiday and a day off. True, the announcement of the Lithuanian Government did not refer to the date as the Independence Day but the day of restoration of the Lithuanian State. While last year hoisting the old national flag was considered something very near treason, next week this year the Statue of Liberty is going to find its way back to the center of Kaunas and a memorial plaque will be fixed back on the wall of the building in Vilnius where the Independence Act was proclaimed 71 years ago. [end recording]

While preparing for this program I spoke with a historian Antanas Kulakauskas, and I asked him how he explained the staggering change in the evaluation of the 16th of February. Antanas Kulakauskas:

[Begin Kulakauskas recording in Lithuanian with superimposed translation in English] This year and last year differ in this respect like day and night. A year ago people kept joking that perestroyka had stuck somewhere short of reaching the eastern boarder of Lithuania. And by now the process of renovation has gained momentum in Lithuania, leaving behind the center itself perhaps.

The essence of revolutionary changes in Lithuania lie in the fact that perestroyka has taken the shape of a national revival here in this country. The Lithuanians have realized that former ideological system was in conformity with the stagnant economy and stagnant social relations. As these had been denounced as erroneous and to be restructured, certain ideological values also had to be reconsidered. [end recording]

I wondered what importance he attached to 16th February and to recognizing the day of a national holiday. Here is what A. Kulakauskas had to say:

[Begin Kulakauskas recording in Lithuanian with superimposd English translation] There cannot be a revival of a nation without the people being conscious of their history. And true interpretation of the nation's past is indispensable and that must be a comprehensive history. No periods in it must be erased and the period of the independent republic of Lithuania between the two world wars is most important in this respect. These years in the history of Lithuania were a major step towards progress, towards Lithuania becoming a nation of European culture and civilization. [end recording]

Before meeting with Antanas Kulakauskas, I heard various speculations as to what made the Lithuanian Communist Party change its attitude towards the republic of Lithuania between the wars. The manifestation of this new attitude is the recognition of 16th February as a national holiday. Some said that that was a maneuver not to fall behind the public feeling and to secure its positions in the upcoming elections late in March. I asked Antanas Kulakauskas what he thought of that.

[Begin Kulakauskas recording in Lithuanian with superimposed English translation] We may have various speculations on this point but I believe that with respect to the majority of the people in the party and in the government this decision cannot be defined as a maneuver to win more votes in the upcoming elections. To my mind the recognition of the importance of spiritual values such like national holidays is a genuine sincere move on the part of the Communist Party and the Lithuanian Government.

I understand that there might be other interpretations of the decision by the Lithuanian authorities to declare 16th February a national holiday. But it is also possible that those interpretations may be spread with certain intentions and aims in mind. [passage omitted]

It is true that national symbols are very important attributes of national self-awareness and national mentality. They greately affect people's emotions, their outlook and even actions. As I said they do not bring any direct achievements in the economic or political sphere. The national flag, national holiday and other symbols are a kind of spiritual landmarks which have to be fallowed in order to achieve their materialization in the tangible economic and political content. [end recording] [passage omitted]

There are facts that the official Lithuanian flag has not been recognised as such on several occasions in other Soviet republics.

Then again some citizens of other nationalities in Lithuania regard that the recently issued decree on the use of Lithuania as the state language is a violation of their rights. [passage omitted] Unconfirmed rumors of changes in the government spread in the capital and a high-ranking official spoke on television that Moscow was concerned about the development of events in Lithuania. Having this in mind I asked Antanas Kulakauskas whether he saw any guarantees that the flow would not be replaced by an ebb again. Here is what he told me:

[Begin Kulakauskas recording in Lithuanian with superimposed English translation] We can speak of juridical guarantees pertaining to the law and laid down in the constitution. But there are also actual guarantees, and these depend on and may be determined by force, which quite often takes the shape of a brutal military clamp down. So if we view our guarantees in this light Lithuania can consolidate its sovereignty and secure its national symbols and holidays for that matter by way of adopting a new constitution the draft of which is expected soon to be submitted to public debate.

But there is always the outside force which can annul all the juridical guarantees.

Still, the question arises here whether it is expedient for the center to hamper the striving of the Baltic states for a certain sovereignty. It is my opinion that those authorities who are paving the way for perestroyka in the center realize very well the significance of the Baltic states as a proving ground of perestroyka.

So, progress in the Baltic states is sure to be advantageous for all the Soviet Union.

On the other hand, however, if dogmatism wins at the center then, of course, there can be no guarantees for us either, as the little one always yields to the big one. [end recording] [passage omitted]

The Lithuanian nation is on the eve of a great holiday and I hope that it is a holiday that will come to stay for ever. [passage omitted]

*** Lithuania's Brazauskas on Improvement of Society**
WA18000487a Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 31 Dec 88 pp 1-3

[Interview with Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian SSR CP Central Committee, conducted by Mindaugas Barisas and Algimantas Budris: "The Goal of Our Work Is To Improve Society"]

[Text] The meeting was scheduled for 10:00 am. We arrived a little ahead of time, hoping to gain a few more minutes for our interview. "You'll have to wait," the secretary told us. After checking her list she invited us to take a seat at a little low table on which stood five light pink carnations, adorning this gloomy Tuesday, the last one of 1988. Another man was also waiting in the reception room for his appointment.

"Does the first secretary ever have any time alone in the course of his working day?"

"Perhaps a few minutes," said the secretary. "But that happens very rarely...."

We went out into the hallway. The Lithuanian SSR CP Central Committee building is generally a quiet place. On the third floor the quiet is more resounding: that is where the Central Committee secretaries' offices are located.

While we were waiting we discussed the fact that only one of us, the oldest, had ever been in the first secretary's office. Almost 30 years before Antanas Snechkus invited him, then a young TIESA reporter (this may seem surprising) to discuss with him how best to cover a rather modest event in the newspaper. The other leaders who have since occupied the building talked only with newspaper editors, not with reporters, handing down their rulings through the former exclusively.

Times change, and the first interview with Algirdas Brazauskas, the new Lithuanian SSR CP Central Committee first secretary, was conducted by a representative of the newspaper's sports department who was renowned, as he should be, for his swiftness and efficiency.

"Please get ready—your appointment is in one minute," said the secretary.

In a moment the previous visitor came out and we entered the office at precisely the appointed time. The walls with their built-in shelves were trimmed in warm wood. One wall consisted almost entirely of glass. But the day was overcast, and Algirdas Brazauskas was sitting at his desk with the lamp on.

Striding forward to greet us, he invited us with a wave of his hand to sit down at another table, the one used for meetings. It was flanked by soft swivel armchairs with nickel-plated frames. We looked uneasily at the two telephones glittering on the first secretary's table. Yet they, like the other phones, did not ring even once. Maybe the first secretary had arranged it that way, or maybe people have finally gotten out of the habit of calling leaders about everything no matter whether they need to or not—that remained a mystery.

We agreed on the ground rules for the interview, and the first secretary of the Lithuanian SSR CP Central Committee began answering questions from the editors of TIESA, both some that had been prepared in advance and some new ones, responding in a lively manner to all the unexpected and not always successful turns the conversation took.

[Correspondent] For a long time you were involved with industry, construction and transportation in your capacity as Lithuanian SSR CP Central Committee secretary. You have been first secretary of the Central Committee for three months now. The New Year is approaching. It is customary to look back when crossing that boundary. Comparing your former and present work, did you find much that was unfamiliar or unexpected in your new position?

[Brazauskas] Naturally there was much that was new and unfamiliar to me. My present duties differ markedly from my previous ones, and the nature of my work is completely different. I have virtually nothing to do with the issues—economic issues—which I dealt with previously; there is no time for that and, besides, that is a secretary's job.

The forms of my work have also changed. Now I have to solve problems which I have never dealt with before. Many of them have arisen in connection with the present situation in Lithuania. For example, the upcoming election of deputies to the USSR and Lithuanian SSR supreme soviets and local soviets. Even now we can see that they are not going to be like any we have had before. There will be fundamental differences in the preparations made for the elections, and the composition of soviets is going to be different. The process of nominating candidates for deputy has already begun. These are people from our republic who are worthy of confidence, people who are worthy of being deputies if they should be elected.

Many matters pertaining to cadre policy also come up. We are reorganizing the Central Committee apparatus. It is being reduced in size. And eliminating cadres is a delicate business. We are attempting to ensure that this process is a fair one and that experienced, authoritative workers do not suffer or feel offended or humiliated.

There is another set of issues with which I am completely unfamiliar: these pertain to the law, constitutional law and preparations for a new Lithuanian SSR Constitution. As you are aware, at the last republic supreme soviet session a committee of deputies was established for the purpose of drawing up a constitution, and I have been assigned the task of guiding that commission, i.e. of being its chairman. This is an extraordinarily complex job. The first draft version prepared by the Academy of Sciences has been reviewed and corrected by a working group of the republic supreme soviet presidium. Now it is being considered by our commission and its subcommissions. In January we will discuss this variation of the draft constitution in great detail and the draft will then be submitted for public discussion, as planned.

Many vital matters come up in my day-to-day work. These are certain matters pertaining to the problems of creative unions, various longstanding ailments of certain labor collectives and many other topics. It is hard to predict in advance the range of problems to be solved. These matters remind me of a snowdrift; you move them once, but then completely new and different problems appear and you have to reorient yourself and solve the new problems in a swift and efficient manner.

Recent months have been filled with social and political events. These include the founding congress of the Lithuanian Movement for Restructuring "Sajudis," election-accounting meetings in primary party organizations, followed by city and rayon party conferences and the election of bureau members and secretaries.... There were also some other notable events. Many of them will leave their mark for a long time to come, and some of them are becoming landmarks in our work. We are encountering the following situation: the representatives of "Sajudis" and other organizations are attempting to speed up the course of events and arrive at quick solutions without first being certain that the alternative proposed is the best one or that it is in fact what people today need.

I think that we need to learn how to live and work in a democratic society, in a state ruled by law. Only by working all together will we make our state one that is governed by law. Nowadays we often repeat the words "democracy" and "pluralism of opinion," but in real life these remain nothing more than words, growing like a pea vine up a mossy wall of bureaucracy.

[Correspondent] Did you ever hope to become first secretary of the republic CP Central Committee?

[Brazauskas] The position bestowed upon me by the Central Committee is a very difficult one. It is a hard job. Did I hope that I would be chosen? You know, I have never thought about that; I was not a professional party worker. Naturally I have acquired certain skills in the 11 years I have spent working in the Central Committee, but first and foremost I thought about my work. Of course now that I have been elected to this post I am attempting to justify people's confidence in me.

[Correspondent] Just recently, during the accounting campaign, quite a few leaders of rayon party organizations lost their jobs. Perhaps you are not well acquainted with some raykom first secretaries....

[Brazauskas] City and rayon party committees have been formed. Indeed, many new secretaries have been elected, and I need to get to know them better. New issues have arisen, and they need to be resolved. Thought must also be given to those secretaries who were not chosen for the newly elected committees.

[Correspondent] Recently there has been much discussion of cost-accounting and economic independence for our republic. The proposals submitted for discussion do not always have the approval of the center. Are Lithuanian leaders' opinions concerning economic sovereignty changing?

[Brazauskas] First of all I must tell you that many of the proposals drafted by us have received support from the center. Regional cost-accounting is a new, serious issue which was first raised at the 19th all-union party conference. It is nice that we, the Academy of Sciences, "Sajudis," the republic agencies which deal with specific economic matters and improvement of the economic administrative mechanism, Gosplan and the state committees on prices and labor have all managed to formulate what I would call a very specific concept of economic independence. Considering the proposals made by the Latvians and the Estonians, you could even say that it has become the basis for a union-wide concept. We are not fully in agreement with some of the proposals it contains, and we see its shortcomings. Therefore we are going to continue to argue in favor of our own proposals and defend them before all-union organizations. However, we have already taken the first step forward: all-union organs, USSR Gosplan and other organizations have acknowledged that a method of administering our country's economy under which the republics will have greater rights is not only acceptable but actually essential. However, economists have a lot of work to do yet to ensure that cost-accounting becomes a reality.

[Correspondent] When and how does your working day begin, and how does it end? How would you allocate your time if it were strictly up to you?

[Brazauskas] My workday begins, like everyone else's, at about 8:30. It ends at various times. Many events, meetings and so on take place in the evening. It is also necessary to visit various collectives, both urban and rural. But generally speaking I try to get home in time to catch "Panorama" on television; I find it interesting to watch.

I think that my work, as well as other people's work, should have more of a plan to it and less spontaneity. All sorts of previously scheduled meetings should be held after lunch. Various current problems should be resolved before lunch. I try to allocate my work time roughly like that. But none of my workdays is like any other.

[Correspondent] Pardon me, comrade secretary, do you exercise in the morning?

[Brazauskas] Yes, I do. But is there any need to write about that?

[Correspondent] Excuse us for the unexpected familiarity, but is it not all right to ask?

[Brazauskas] Of course you may ask. I get up every morning at 7:00 am and do calisthenics...

[Correspondent] So that means your working day starts earlier...

[Brazauskas] But is that part of my working day? That is the start of a day in my life. I would also recommend that other people do exercises in the morning. We talk a lot about sports and physical culture. These are a part of culture, and intellectual development should not be separate from physical culture, which is obligatory for every cultured person and is a very important aspect of all our lives.

My schedule is such that I simply do not have the time to participate in group sports activity. I make use of the time that I do have.

I do not avoid physical labor either in the garden or in the house. I think that the nature of my job—shut up in an office and sitting all the time—requires adequate compensation, and not just on vacation.

[Correspondent] So you could say that your workday begins at 7:00 am, and ends...

[Brazauskas] Ends? It is hard to say precisely when. I have to do a lot of reading at home as well; in the course of a day a great deal of information accumulates that I have to know. I am ashamed to admit it, but sometimes I do not even get a chance to look at a newspaper until evening.

[Correspondent] You have talked about the importance of physical culture, but we also know that you are not indifferent to sports....

[Brazauskas] Formerly I devoted a great deal of time to sailing. I also did track and field when I was a student; I threw the hammer, tossed the discus and put the shot, and once I was even on the Lithuanian all-star team. Subsequently my life developed in such a way that I had to bid farewell to sports. All I have left is physical culture. Most of all it was the sailing "bug" that bit me: I have sailed on both Olympic yachts and cruisers. I have worked to ensure that our master sailors can go out to sea; a few decades it was a very big problem to get to do so. Today we can be proud of the fact that our yachts are already entering European waters, and we hope that they will reach the shores of North America in the near future. So I have kept in touch with sailing, and I try to help those who are involved in it.

[Correspondent] Formerly, before you were first secretary, you were often seen on the streets of Vilnius. And now?

[Brazauskas] Indeed, I do walk around the streets of Vilnius less frequently now, on account of being so busy, not because of the position I hold. Working downtown one does try to get out and walk. That is both interesting and necessary; it keeps one from losing touch with people's concerns. I like drop by some stores....

[Correspondent] And what sort of reception do you get in stores?

[Brazauskas] I visit them in Vilnius, and I take a look at village stores when I am visiting rayon centers. Naturally I would like for them to be somewhat richer, in terms of both quality and quantity. The figures on turnover of goods and the amount of goods available per capita seem pretty good, yet as a result of many factors, external factors in particular, the people of our republic still do not have an adequate supply of goods. Though we have large material resources we live in a common economic complex, and thus we cannot maintain a high level of supply. The problem that we must solve in the near future is ensuring that the goods allocated to our republic reach the people of Lithuania.

[Correspondent] I get the impression that you have no difficulty relating to people of different age groups, differing views and varying educational levels. Is that something you were born with, or is it an acquired trait?

[Brazauskas] I do not know if it is possible to acquire that trait. Maybe it is... I have never thought about it. It seems to me that all this should come naturally. Maybe it goes back to my childhood that I never force my will on people or dictate my opinion to them. I have usually made my decisions after listening to what other people had to say. I think that respect for people is the basis for communication. If you respect the person with whom you are talking first as a human being and then a specialist or a leader communication between you will come naturally.

[Correspondent] Have you had any difficult moments in the last three months?

[Brazauskas] There have been plenty not just of difficult moments, but whole difficult hours and days. Especially at the start. The republic Supreme Soviet session of 18-19 November was difficult. There we made historic decisions which now, unfortunately, seem to have faded. Many people did not comprehend or value them. When we were discussing changes in certain points of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution the course of the session somehow told me what I had to say. I was convinced and today as well think that we have absolutely no need of spontaneous, poorly-reasoned proposals which yield no concrete results. We must ceaselessly move ahead, discuss everything well, weigh things and only then make decisions. Because a state cannot change, its Constitution and laws and their content cannot undergo fundamental changes, in the span of a few months. This is a process. We must remember that we are a part of the Soviet Union; if we bear this in mind we will make the appropriate political decisions.

[Correspondent] Nowadays we talk a lot about new political thinking. How is that being manifested, and how should it be manifested in party work?

[Brazauskas] I do not know whether it is really possible to start thinking in a new way; after all, we are only human. I would say that we need to understand other people's thinking and react to it differently. I feel that the modern party worker should perceive all the phenomena that are occurring in society in a new way. We cannot cling to the old, stereotypical way of thinking that everything we are doing is good and everything people who think differently are doing is bad. That was how it used to be. Now we must think and weigh how the majority thinks and why they are thinking that way, what their reasoning is. Of course we cannot be in absolute agreement with all opinions; we do have our party line and our ideology to which we have adhered in the past and to which we will continue to adhere. We are going to have to reject unbalanced, unproven opinions which could set us back and cancel out the things which we have already achieved today. I am in favor of the kind of secretaries—whether in a rayon, a city or the Central Committee—who can boldly discuss with people who think differently than they do, prove that what their position is correct and have a tolerant attitude toward others' ideas, who are able to talk or give a speech before any audience.

I would also like to wish party workers and the members of public organizations and movements the ability to delight in their accomplishments. Because we have a tendency to achieve one thing and then immediately launch into the next cause, thinking that the previous victory is no longer important...and so on it goes. This palace must be built one brick at a time. We have many untapped resources in our economy today. If we made maximum use of our opportunities and freedoms, of the elements of sovereignty which we already have, then we would be able to live better. Naturally we are going to fight for sovereignty in the broad sense of the word; that is one of the basic conditions for development of society and its improvement, and that is our goal. However, I do not understand people who think that once we have achieved sovereignty everything in our lives is going to change by itself. We are going to need persistent labor which will perhaps not be pleasant for everyone. We do not talk about this as much.

[Correspondent] At rallies attended by thousands of people it seemed that people were thinking unanimously, yet on the job there is a lack of that same unity....

[Brazauskas] Of unity and resolve. When we vote, when we say aloud that something is our civic duty, then everyone is in favor. But when each individual arrives at his own work place that resolve fades. As if one were supposed to behave differently there.

[Correspondent] In your report devoted to the 70th anniversary of the Lithuanian SSR Communist Party and the proclamation of Soviet power in Lithuania you once again condemned Stalinism. Did you ever encounter the manifestations of Stalinism when you were young?

[Brazauskas] At that time I was still in school, or a student at the institute; perhaps I did not suffer directly from Stalinism, but Stalinism pervaded the academic process, particularly in the social sciences.

I saw the harsh fate of people around me—my neighbors and friends, my classmates who disappeared from school. I also saw the tragic consequences of the class struggle in the postwar years....

[Correspondent] Recently you spoke at a general party meeting of the Lithuanian creative unions. That speech eloquently demonstrated that you are not indifferent to the arts and that you understand the interests of the artistic intelligentsia. What traits of the creative personality do you prize most highly?

[Brazauskas] In the arts, as in everything, I value a high degree of professionalism above all. That always charms me, whether it be in a chamber orchestra or the work of a writer or poet (I could mention many names). There are all kinds of artists, but I have the greatest respect for the ones who give all their talent to their profession, who remain at the peak of their creativity, who do not compromise in their creative work.

[Correspondent] You have had and still have comrades with whom you see outside of work as well. Have your relationships with them not changed?

[Brazauskas] I can firmly state that they have not changed at all. I would be very sad if they had changed. I would be sad even if my friends, who will perhaps read this interview, thought that way.

[Correspondent] The young people in our editorial offices asked us to ask you how you met your wife....

[Brazauskas] I met my wife Yulya a very long time ago. We have been together for 30 years now. Our daughters are grown, and our grandchildren are not small anymore. I met her while I was a student at the polytechnical institute; she graduated from the medical department and now works as a doctor. We met at a young people's evening, which was quite natural: our department at the institute was almost all male, while there were many women in the medical department. We often talked....

[Correspondent] Which, in your opinion, are the source of the greatest joy: children or grandchildren?

[Brazauskas] If I said grandchildren my children would be offended. I think that a person has different joys at each stage of life. When our children were small we took great joy in them. Now they have made their own lives and grown away from us somewhat; they have their own interests. At the same time one becomes more mature oneself, and one's love for one's grandchildren is something quite different. One looks at them through the eyes of a quite older person.

[Correspondent] Obviously as a child you did not dream of the becoming the leading individual in our republic... .You began you career as an engineer. What determines the choice of a given profession?

[Brazauskas] I do not think that the choice of a profession is determined by anyone's urging, but rather by the overall situation in a family. I say that on the basis of my own experience and the experience of my wife, my children, relatives and friends. In short, numerous factors influence one's choice of a profession.

I am a hydraulic construction engineer. When I was young we were impressed by the big construction projects, the gigantic hydroelectric power plants with their powerful equipment, and the big collectives, where I got a chance to work during my practical training. We were impressed by the opportunity to use natural resources for the good of human beings. Now in many places around the world people are turning back to the use of water and wind energy. I did a lot of work on construction projects, then later it turned out that I transferred to the field of economics. I had to win a certain level of qualification and study science, write a scientific work. I am happy that in addition to an engineering degree I also hold the title of economist. That has been very helpful to me in my present job.

[Correspondent] Our conversation will be published in TIESA on Friday. In the evening television viewers are expecting for a meeting with you on the program "Government Studio." Which questions that you have received in preparation for that broadcast were the most difficult to answer, and which were the most pleasant?

[Brazauskas] It was probably most difficult to answer questions that make very large demands. Perhaps I am repeating myself when I say that we must not hurry, that we need to think things over, take counsel and resolve things through joint efforts. It is always difficult to explain this to people, and there were so many questions of this sort. The easiest and most pleasant answers to give are when you can say that someone's problem has already been solved.

[Correspondent] What would you wish our readers and... yourself on the eve of 1989?

[Brazauskas] Above all I would like to wish all the people of Lithuania tranquil, meaningful work and lives. I want every one of us—schoolchild, student, worker, farmer or intellectual—to sense a good moral atmosphere at his or her place of work and derive a sense of satisfaction from what he or she does. Tremendous problems have arisen in the political life of society; the majority of these should be resolved to the great benefit of our republic during the coming year. I am referring to sovereignty and economic independence. But in this regard we must all strive to achieve tangible results, work in such a way that our society will be able to feel those results. And I would wish the same thing for myself.

[Correspondent] Thank you for our conversation and your wishes.

* * *

After we turned off our tape recorders we said goodbye. We checked the dictaphone timers in the hallway, and they all agreed. The conversation which had been scheduled for half an hour had lasted 57 minutes.

In the reception room we got a chance to shake hands with a republic minister. He had an 1100 appointment with the first secretary.

Latvian Journalists Demand Independent Union

LD1302144389 Riga in Latvian to Europe 2130 GMT 8 Feb 89

[Text] An extraordinary congress of the Latvian SSR Union of Journalists took place last Friday and Saturday. [passage omitted]

Special attention was paid to the newspapers published in Russian from which a considerable part of local inhabitants and also inhabitants of other regions of our country, as well as readers abroad gain information. It was emphasized at the congress that mass information media to this

very day, not less than other organizations and enterprises, are subjected to dictates from the center. It is also not known where the considerable income produced by journalists goes to, but the technical means of journalists are more than modest. The opinon that it is not the authority of power but the power of authority that has to be used gained general support at the congress.

An important group of problems is connected with the functioning of Latvia's Union of Journalists itself. The existing regulations, within the framework of the USSR Union of Journalists, are a hindrance. Therefore, the demand was made to establish an independent Latvian SSR Union of Journalists. [passage omitted]

'Migrant' Serviceman in Latvia on People's Front

PM1502170189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Feb 89 First Edition p 4

[Report by Captain Third Rank V. Verbitskiy: "Is It Easy To Be a 'Migrant?' What Lies Behind Some of the Demands of the Latvian People's Front"]

[Text] Liyepaya—In the language of some Baltic informal organizations, I, like all servicemen who by the will of fate have found themselves on the territory of Latvia, Lithuania, or Estonia, am a "migrant." And if we are to believe some of these same informal groups, I am an uninvited guest who is depriving the local population of local bread, water, air, housing, and so forth which I have done nothing to "deserve." In the long term, if the ideas included in the programs of a number of public movements are implemented, I shall also lose the legal right to all these benefits.

But now it's time to turn to the facts. Just one necessary stipulation: Inasmuch as I serve in the Latvian city of Liyepaya, the examples illustrating my arguments will naturally be mainly local.

For 2 days I followed most attentively the progress of the constituent congress of the Latvian People's Front and then spent just as long following the events at the forum of the peoples of the republic and then at the constituent congress of the International Front. I have read some 150 items in the republican SOVETSKAYA LATVIA and CINA, Liyepaya's KOMMUNIST, the journal RODNIK, and other publications and viewed a dozen "Labvakar" ("Good Evening") television programs.

And when I tried to categorize all the facts which I had collected, what at first glance seemed a strange natural law emerged. Grievances against the "nonindigenous population," as the local informal groups awkwardly put it, are of an exclusively "historical nature." The 1940 "occupation," Stalin's repressions, the migration to "large industrial enterprises irrationally created in traditionally agricultural Latvia," and so forth. Actually, they were all concentrated at some length on an enormous poster which was held by pickets during the work of the constituent congress of the International Front outside the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee political enlightenment center in Riga. The newspaper SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH published a photograph of this poster in its 20 January 1989 issue. Here is what was written on it (spelling and syntax as in the original): "If you liberated us and for that remained to live here.... If you came to give friendly help but remained forever.... If here you promised us Communism but brought a totalitarian regime.... If here you also took our native language, land, and sea—then we will say to you: Ivan go home! (the last words are in English—author's note). And don't try to accuse the Letts of national hostility and don't try to pretend to be internationalists."

I believe there is nothing to comment on here.

But let's continue on the subject of natural laws. They are as follows: For all the "historical grievances," for the blunders, errors, and even crimes of specific individuals they are demanding full payment from no less specific people living in the republic today. I personally do not have to go far to find examples. A week ago there appeared on the wall of the apartment block where I live a 28 inch high paint aerosol graffito reading: "Russians out of Latvia!"

How can we fail here to "touch on" the black hundreders' notorious slogan which claims that foreigners are to blame for all Russia's troubles. Narrow-minded nationalism, whatever masks it may don, is always "international" in its jesuitical methods and means.

The 6 November 1988 issue of the Liyepaya newspaper KOMMUNIST published an item by editorial office staffer L. Leyne entitled "Roots," which contained overt libel and lies against the Army. From her lips the newspaper's 20,000 readers learned of "the Russian soldiers' monstrous betrayal of the Latvian boys first in the Christmas 1916 fighting" and then during the defense of Libava [former name of Liyepaya] in 1941. Moreover, in the latter case Leyne went so far as to claim that the Soviet troops left the city and the Lettish workers to be torn to pieces by the fascists the day after the start of the Great Patriotic War. Was it possible to insult more blasphemously the memory of the thousands of Soviet servicemen who fell during the legendary "7 heroic days" of the defense of Libava?!

Letters full of indignation arrived in Liyepaya from Moscow, Leningrad, Mogilev, Chimkent, and Kislovodsk. Two front line veterans, S. Chudnovskiy and V. Zheleztsov, sent their letter to the editorial office and to the party gorkom. They also obtained documentary corroboration that it had all reached the addresses 24 November. But it has become known that to this day the veterans have not even been favored with a reply. The newspaper is also shamefacedly keeping silent....

It is true that when matters affect let us say contradictory situations, the newspaper sets to work actively. You only have to cite the following characteristic instance. On

New Year's Eve KOMMUNIST published an item full of "noble" emotion about vandals who had "cut down the festive tree at the station." The angry city public was stating unequivocally that "Letts could not have done that." Angry letters and telephone calls flooded into the editorial office. The newspaper gloats over them in a survey. But a little over a week later it emerged that the tree had been brought down by... a stormy wind. And, given a minimal desire to do so, this could have been ascertained immediately on the spot. And everything is repeated again. You think the newspaper apologized for publishing unchecked and biased information? Not at all. It published a minuscule note compiled in a very skittish tone: "...It was not a crime against society but a kind of 'accident' which occurred. And let our readers see it as a New Year practical joke which no one could have predicted," the newspaper correspondent wrote.

But unfortunately this lesson had no effect. Literally immediately the newspaper published the comment "Small Flash of Humanity" describing the compassion of the Latvian People's Front activists. Before the Near Year they had indeed given the invalid Afghan veterans living in Liyepaya R200 each. That was a very good act. But there is one thing which is depressing. The newspaper immediately criticizes the workers of the Liyepaya military commissariat who allegedly do not even know the addresses of the internationalist servicemen. Is that the case? Some 2 weeks later the editorial office was forced to apologize publicly to the military commissariat for its "slip of the pen." It is true that public opinion had already gotten to work and as usual the apology was barely visible...?

And the libel against the Russian Army with regard to those Christmas battles was in fact refuted by none other than one of the leaders of the Latvian People's Front, the poet Yanis Peters, who on 24 December last year published in SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA an item entitled "Returning to Christmas": "In those battles Russia lost 19,000 soldiers, including 5,000 Lettish riflemen." So three Russians fell alongside each Lettish boy. But here too KOMMUNIST preferred to keep quiet.

Inasmuch as I bear an officer's epaulettes, I cannot fail to be perturbed by the situation which has taken shape around the Liyepaya naval officers' center. In the past few months it has literally been giving no rest to some representatives of the Latvian People's Front. It was first on the night of 17-18 November last year that activists of the organization, having secretly climbed onto the roof of the officers' center, hoisted the national Lettish flag over it. The next day, again secretly, they stuck to the windows photographs recording the hoisting of the flag. Then several items appeared in the city newspaper demanding that "the officers' center building be returned to the Lettish people."

Considering the fact that the newspaper is the organ of the gorkom and city soviet and the author of the recent publication is deputy editor of the newspaper and a secretary of the party organization, I turned to the publishers' spokesmen. Nothing happened. I did not in fact receive any sensible reply to the question: Why and for what purpose is it necessary to abolish the only institution in the city center which propagandizes Russian culture (the auditorium of the officers' center is also the auditorium of the theater of the Baltic Fleet) and is accessible to spectators of any nationality and social allegiance?

Incidentally, for the tenth month now the museum of combat glory attached to the officers' center has been under a boycott: Schoolchildren from Lettish schools have stopped visiting it. Formerly these excursions (in the Lettish language, let us note) were held regularly.

On 28 December 1988 a protest was lodged against the Latvian People's Front program by the republic's prosecutor as contradicting the USSR Constitution, the Latvian SSR Constitution, and other legislative acts. But the People's Front leaders immediately found a way out of the situation: They included in the Latvian People's Front election platform virtually all the points against which the prosecutor had lodged a protest.

The People's Front bulletin ATMODA [name as published] ("Awakening") published under the headline "The Main Thing" clear and unambiguous instructions for the election struggle: "Be tactically intelligent, agree that the selection of a common candidate from the Latvian People's Front be ensured for the entire electoral okrug and rely here on the collective opinion of the rayon division of the Latvian People's Front... Even more—pursue active propaganda..."

Actually, may God be with this instruction. Ultimately it is not a question of tactics. The main thing is with what is the Latvian People's Front coming to the elections? The Latvian People's Front does not recognize the leading role of the CPSU in Soviet society, demands the institution of republican citizenship and the republic's own currency, and insists on ensuring at all levels of power in the soviets a constant irreducible majority of seats which will be kept for representatives of the Lettish nationality in any demographic situation in the republic.

In my opinion, it is hard even for an absolutely neutral, unbiased person not to see a certain system in all these facts. Nonetheless I am not inclined to generalize from individual examples and on this basis to draw conclusions as to the nature of the Latvian People's Front.

It must be admitted that there are constructive and useful elements in its activity. But all this is frequently dissolved in extremist appeals and in meetings on democracy. Again I cite what I have seen.

One may of course put forward ecological slogans (very correct ones, incidentally!) but even if you have a meeting for a week on the shore of a depleted lake the fish stocks will not increase as a result. Every morning, on my

way to serve, I can see representatives of the No. 23 construction administration constructing a Liyepaya residential region cluttering the bank of the very beautiful Liyepaya lake with rubbish. But no pickets appear here, no one demands that the names of the despoilers of nature be made public or calls for a subbotnik to be organized and held and for the lake not to be ruined in future....

Nor can I fail to touch on one more topic—the stance which was taken by our fleet political workers in everything happening in, for instance, Liyepaya. Unfortunately in their majority they adopted a wait and see stance. We talk so much about the need for assertiveness and activeness in ideological work. It would seem this is a fine opportunity to implement this principle in practice. Alas. Measures which would be at least of an informative, explanatory nature, never mind debates, political battles, and so forth, can be counted on the fingers of one hand. Yet they are very necessary.

The People's Front demands that an enterprise pay a subscription of R25,000 for every specialist invited to the region and that a 10-year qualification be established for residence in Latvia, only after which will it be possible to receive the right to housing or to improve it. They deem it essential to admit to the VUZes only inhabitants of the republic and others only on the compulsory condition that they immediately leave the "territory" after receiving their diploma.

All these ill-considered, to put it mildly, demands, from the Latvian People's Front are naturally also addressed to servicemen and the members of their families.

And now judge for yourselves whether it is easy to be a "migrant?" The situation in my city once again compels me to turn to the conclusion of the 19th all-union party conference to the effect that we must learn to distinguish between genuinely national interests and their nationalist manifestations. Any claims to national exclusiveness are intolerable and offensive. Let's distinguish correctly between what is the true wave of restructuring and what is the scum on this wave. After all our present and our future lie in the consolidation and unity of all Soviet peoples.

Estonia Registers People's Front Charter

PM1402165989 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 4 Feb 89 p 1

[ETA-attributed report by K. Propst: "In the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Excerpts] A session of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chaired by A. Ryutel, chairman of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, took place on 2 February. As is known, on 2 October 1988 a Charter, which is subject to registration in the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, was adopted by the Estonian People's Front Congress. The presidium examined documents essential for registration.

Kh. Valk, member of the Estonian People's Front board, spoke at the session.

"As we all know," he said, "the restructuring process in the Soviet Union was initiated from above—by the CPSU. In support of this process a so-called revolution from below and the people's broad support for this movement, naturally, had to follow. As one form of this support in the republic the Estonian People's Front was set up as a social movement, based on citizens' initiative, whose main aim is to mold an active political stance among all Soviet Estonia's inhabitants and to support and organize this activity.

"The People's Front is a movement open to all, giving all citizens of Soviet Estonia, on the basis of free will, the opportunity to participate in this movement, regardless of their nationality, party allegiance, and creed.

"Through political activity the People's Front aims to influence citizens to turn our republic into a rule-of-law state, assist in further developing democracy, and further improve the power mechanism. Moreover, it believes that the recognition of Estonia as a sovereign Soviet Socialist Republic in the true sense of this word is very vital. From the moment of its formation, that is from April 1988, the Estonian People's Front very quickly won the recognition and support of the broad masses, which also soon enabled it to establish itself as an entirely real social force.

"From the very beginning the People's Front put forward as one of the prerequisites of its activity close cooperation with all those public and political forces and organizations in Estonia which support restructuring and democratic processes. This is one of the principles which we wanted to follow throughout. So, the close cooperation of the People's Front with the Estonian Communist Party, the republic's creative unions, the 'Green' movement and all those sociopolitical organizations and movements which support the ideas of restructuring is understandable.

"We see the Communist Party's leading role in the People's Front as reflected in the personal example of Communists who are actively participating in the People's Front activity and in their exhortations to support restructuring. This form of link with the Communist Party was also recognized by the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee. As a matter of fact, the People's Front originated on the initiative of Communists. The initiators of this movement were Communists who are now also members of the leading organs of the People's Front as the most influential, most prestigious force. Officially the People's Front has been in existence for less than 6 months. I recall that our constituent congress took place 1-2 October 1988. This very first

stage took place in the context of organizing our work and forming our structure. But there is still a great deal of change and reassessment needed here. We came to the conclusion that it is essential to correct a number of forms in our work, but the form of the movement, which is not as rigorous as an organization or union, makes all this possible. So, based on political reality and the new opportunities and changes stemming from this reality, we can constantly make changes to our activity. From the outset the People's Front tried not to limit itself to any overly rigid forms of activity. As a peoplewide [vsenarodnyy] movement we constantly listen to the people's voice; this stems from our structure, because our support groups, which now cover virtually the entire territory of Estonia and a significant part of Estonia's active population, are its prime component. So the link of our People's Front leading organs with all the people and with our movement's grassroots components is constant and unbroken.

"The People's Front Charter—the People's Front program—was adopted at the People's Front Congress by a majority of votes; consequently it expresses the will of Estonian SSR citizens who are part of the People's Front. It was recently published in a single brochure both in Estonian and in Russian, and will also soon be published in English, so that everyone who is interested in it has the chance to get to know this document.

"I would like to conclude my speech by expressing confidence that, although the People's Front has been in existence in the Estonian SSR for a short time, it has justified its emergence and its aim—to organize and generate Estonian SSR citizens' political initiative and activity. So, it has obviously fulfilled, or more accurately, is fulfilling its most important function—to support the restructuring process in Soviet Estonia."

L. Koyk, member of the Estonian People's Front board, answered questions from Presidium members about legal aspects of the People's Front Charter.

In accordance with the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree of 17 January 1989 "On the Provisional Procedure for Registering the Regulations (Basic Document) of Citizens' Associations" the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium adopted a decision to register the Estonian People's Front Charter. [passage omitted]

Vayno Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, and member of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, took part in the session's work.

Estonian Labor Collective Council Meets

PM1402085789 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 1 Feb 89 p 3

[S. Lepik report: "A Time for Concrete Deeds"]

[Text] Journalists of only three publications responded to the invitation to take part in the work of a session of the presidium of "conspirators," as the United Council of Labor Collectives [OSTK] is sometimes called. The rest ignored it. And mistakenly. First, it was a marvelous opportunity to strip the layer of rumor and conjecture from this public organization. Second, discussion at the OSTK Presidium session was really businesslike and committed. It examined questions which are to be submitted for discussion by a meeting of delegates before the end of the month.

The OSTK draft program was discussed particularly extensively, particularly its third section, which deals with collaboration between the OSTK and its member enterprises and local soviets and other regional management organs. It was decided to carry out thorough additional work on it. A sensible form for such collaboration was also found—the rayon (city) soviet regional economic council, which is called upon to serve as a public consultative body. It is being set up with the aim of enhancing the standard of economic work and accelerating the region's socioeconomic development. The presidium examined and approved the draft statute on the regional economic council and the draft agreement between this organ and the local soviet.

A number of work plans were offered for the attention of session participants. The comprehensive social policy plan, for example, fully reveals the OSTK's real aspirations. The plan's thrust and task is to increase the contribution made to republic affairs by OSTK enterprises. Thus it is planned to study questions of constructing a children's polyclinic in Kalininskiy Rayon, a hospital and swimming pool in Lasnamyae, and a sports equipment center at Palyassaare, laying new heating and water-supply pipes, and modernizing existing ones. Moreover, it is planned to pool enterprises' efforts in constructing housing, leisure centers, and pioneer camps.

It is noteworthy that after hearing the information report delivered by I. Papulovskiy, chairman of the constituent committee of the "Svetoch" cultural enlightenment association, the presidium backed this new public organization's ideas and promised it material support. Such cooperation will help further enhance the tone of the cultural and spiritual life of the Russian-speaking section of the republic's population. The plans of "Svetoch's" initiators include a meeting with the leadership of the Estonian Union of Labor Collectives, since the cultural enlightenment association sees its task not only as increasing opportunities for the inhabitants of Estonia to strengthen their national cultures but also as making them more aware of the history, traditions, customs, and spiritual life of the Estonian people.

The OSTK Presidium examined the letters it had been sent. They are mostly requests. The very fact of receiving such letters is evidence of the organization's growing authority. Two more labor collectives, with a work force of around 4,000, were admitted to the OSTK at the session.

Summing up, OSTK Chairman V. Yarovoy stressed that the period of concrete deeds has arrived in the organization's work.

Estonian Cultural Council Urges Citizenship Laws
LD1402150389 Tallinn SIRP JA VASAR in Estonian 3 Feb 89 p 3

[Article headlined: "In the Cultural Council of Creative Unions"]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] The following letter, however, was sent to the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium and to the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee:

The Cultural Council of the Estonian Creative Unions discussed the present state and prospects of Estonian political development, on 16 and 31 January 1989. [passage omitted]

The Cultural Council considers it extremely necessary that the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet should immediately begin to work out constitutional acts for citizenship and other legislative acts connected with this, including in this work representatives of democratic forces in the society for this purpose, including the creative intelligentsia. [passage omitted]

People's deputies voted for the compromise version of the law on language prompted by the knowledge that soon the law on language will be followed by other laws to reorganize Estonian society, including a law on citizenship. Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic citizenship will serve as a bridge also for Estonians and their offspring living abroad to travel along the lengthy path of returning home. It is only when Estonian SSR citizenship is constitutionalized and implemented that preconditions will be created to restore social justice, to restore the inalienable rights of the indigenous population and to ensure a feeling of home and security in Estonia. [passage omitted]

Estonian Komsomol Elects Newspaper Editor
PM1402084589 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 4 Feb 89 p 2

[ETA-attributed report by M. Kornysheva: "Elected Editor"]

[Text] At an extended session of the Estonian Komsomol Central Committee Bureau, which took place 3 February, the agitated discussion and heated arguments which developed around the editorship of the NOORTE HAAL newspaper, which has just become free, were summed up. The candidates for this responsible post—Tynu Vare, and Ivo Laks, deputy editors of this newspaper, and Margus Mets, senior correspondent of the RAHVA HAAL newspaper—put forward their platforms. Unfortunately, the session's participants could not rely on the opinion of people directly concerned, since the youth newspaper's editorial office split into several "factions" supporting one or other candidate. As a result the bureau members had a secret ballot—and 27-year old M. Mets was elected editor by a majority of just one vote.

Without concealing his fatigue, he said when accepting congratulations:

"What I have inherited, and my new colleagues can also confirm this, is a far from 'profitable' post. The main work still lies ahead."

Margus Meto takes up his post on Monday.

Afanasyev on Memorial Society, Stalinism Quagmire
AU1402192189 Hamburg DER SPIEGEL in German 13 Feb 89 pp 164-166

[Interview with Soviet historian Yuriy Afanasyev by DER SPIEGEL: "Getting Out of the Quagmire of Stalinism; Interview With Soviet Historian Yuriy Afanasyev by DER SPIEGEL on the founding of the 'Memorial' Society"; place and date not given—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Yuriy Afanasyev is one of the most prominent and militant representatives of the Soviet anti-Stalinism movement. He chaired the union-wide founding congress of the "Memorial" Society, which advocates the complete clarification of the repression in the Stalin era and demands compensation for the victims. The 55-year old historian started his career as a Komsomol functionary. In 1981 he became qualified as a specialist for historical science abroad, and he has been the director of the Moscow Institute for Historical Archives for more than 2 years.

DER SPIEGEL: Yuriy Nikolayevich, now the anti-Stalinist movement in the Soviet Union has become a real organization with statutes, proper bookkeeping, and an executive committee, and will certainly also have full-time employees in the near future. Your fellow historian Roy Medvedev has warned about the danger of bureaucratization and has advocated a large-scale movement of all anti-Stalinist forces. Why have you nevertheless decided in favor of an association with strict rules?

Afanasyev: "Memorial" does not lay claim to a monopoly. On the contrary: We strictly adhere to the pluralist principles of perestroyka and welcome the creation of an open society with democratic laws and norms. However, those who want a large-scale movement for their good cause, also strive for an organization to make the consistent, final extinction of Stalinism, together with its roots, something that is really the affair of all people. Moreover, do not forget the psychological aspect: So far, the activists from "Memorial" have felt that their surroundings are hostile to them. In their opinion, an

organization protects them from this hostility to a certain degree. In fact, the adherents of our movement encounter massive resistance in many places, which often cannot be rationally explained.

DER SPIEGEL: The new Soviet electoral law provides for a certain quota of deputies to the new People's Congress for union-wide organizations. Was it maybe intended to deny this privilege to "Memorial" by delaying its founding for months?

Afanasyev: I do not completely exclude this, although the reasons are probably more deep-seated. One simply did not want to grant "Memorial" the thing that is our central and most important principle, complete independence. This is also the real significance of this founding: its character as an example, the invitation to imitate it. However, many people, of course, did not like our objectives, our intention to safeguard the immortal memory of the victims of Stalinism and to make the past accessible without any blank spots, restrictions, or reservations.

DER SPIEGEL: Does the close treatment of history encroach upon the question of power?

Afanasyev: For many, yes. This is exactly the point at which many people's instinct for self-preservation and thus, at the same time, the preservation of their power, are touched upon. In our country the state has developed a totalitarian claim for many decades and has become used to determining many things which must be part of the tasks and rights of the public, if the citizens' joint responsibility is to be developed. However, as if with a sixth sense, the representatives of the state know that they have appropriated something for themselves that does not belong to them. Therefore, they regard not only "Memorial" as a threat, but also any other sign of autonomy and independence.

DER SPIEGEL: How do you want to overcome this post-Stalinist commando system?

Afanasyev: If one day our society has public archives and libraries at its disposal, if the whole dimension of Stalin's crimes becomes visible for everybody, an important contribution will be made to the profound changes that are necessary in our country. However, "Memorial" alone will not succeed in this. It has to become a matter for all people to force the state back by developing a self-confident, critical society of citizens.

DER SPIEGEL: What tasks will "Memorial" tackle first?

Afanasyev: First, we have to find our place between the various currents of democratization that are now becoming visible in our country. Then it has to be shown that we ourselves meet the moral claims that we make as regards our people's history and present—that we thus do not aspire to a monopoly, do not have administrative interests, and are open to everybody. The past belongs to all of us, it is the joint property of the present and the future generations. Only if this is taken into account will "Memorial" be able to develop into an effective force against new mistakes and crimes, against new eruptions of violence and calls for fratricide. And, finally, we need a magazine for communication between all members, but above all for briefing the public on our work, as well as on how it is obstructed.

DER SPIEGEL: Many complained precisely about this at the founding conference in which representatives from more than 100 Soviet cities participated: Many had been warned by their local authorities against going to Moscow....

Afanasyev: ... and others were even prevented from doing so, for example, in Alma Ata. Even worse is an event which delegates from Orel reported: From there, "Memorial" members turned to the USSR Supreme Court to get more information on executions of political prisoners in Orel prison during Stalin's era in autumn 1941. The Supreme Court's military panel claimed in its answer that no information whatsoever is available on this. In plain language, this probably means that the colleagues in Orel should be so kind as to deal with other things. Such outrageous lies by public authorities have to be made known all over the Soviet Union.

DER SPIEGEL: Would you have liked a greetings message from Mikhail Gorbachev for your founding ceremony?

Afanasyev: Of course. We have also striven for it. I consider the "Memorial" movement as so important that the party should show a greater interest and pay more heed to it. For if we do not free ourselves from the quagmire of Stalinism, we will not advance one single step.

DER SPIEGEL: "Memorial" has demanded financial compensation for the survivors of Stalin's terror and that the means for it will not be provided from the coffers of the state but, above all, from those of the party. Do you regard this as realistic?

Afanasyev: It would be an expression of justice if one helped the victims and their surviving dependents efficiently and to the best of one's abilities. Public funds can also be used for this. However, above all, the party has to finally assume the responsibility for what has happened. I cannot imagine a better expression of this responsibility than concrete material compensation.

DER SPIEGEL: Let us assume that "Memorial" could organize a referendum on its program—the condemnation of Stalinism: What would be the result?

Afanasyev: We have advocated public condemnation of Stalinism, however, we are decidedly against judging individual persons according to the example of the

Nuremberg Tribunal. However, many people would also reject moral condemnation. Nobody can give percentages, but Stalinism is deeply rooted in the Soviet people's feelings and their way of thinking. It is a kind of Stalinism of the people which is understandable and even pardonable to a certain degree.

DER SPIEGEL: This sounds strangely conciliatory....

Afanasyev: The people lived under the conditions of Stalinism, they did not know anything else. There were bitter things, but also many pleasant ones, much enthusiasm—and all this was closely linked to Stalin's name.

DER SPIEGEL: This applies to the older generation. But what about neo-Stalinism?

Afanasyev: It is far more terrible and dangerous because its motives are mainly personal and political careerism: The reactionary threat to perestroyka is rooted there.

DER SPIEGEL: How do you, as a historian, assess the theory of totalitarianism, which claims that Stalinism and fascism are largely the same?

Afanasyev: The comparison of social development is legitimate and necessary, its epistemological value is undisputed. I saw the film "Every-Day Fascism" by Mikhail Romm, the great Soviet documentary film director, several times, and as early as the first time I felt a certain uneasiness that I was not able to explain at that time. However, later I knew that many things in fascism were similar to what we have experienced ourselves: the symbols, the rituals, the slogans, the feasts, the songs.

However, not only by their symbols, but also by their character every-day fascism and every-day Stalinism can be compared. There are also many similiarities in the deep roots of the two totalitarian systems, in their aspiration for monopolization. Despite this, simply putting Stalinism and fascism on the same level is not admissible. The historical and social causes, but also their political motives are too different.

DER SPIEGEL: During the founding congress, you defended the arrested Armenians from the Karabakh Committee as "honest democrats" and demanded their immediate release. In your opinion, can somebody who regards these Armenians as dangerous nationalists be a credible anti-Stalinist?

Afanasyev: No, I do not believe so. Precisely in this respect, past and present events have to be understood in the same way. Many of our present problems, worries, and omissions are appearing in the Armenian movement.

DER SPIEGEL: Apparently, your opinion on this is clearly different from that of General Secretary Gorbachev.

Afanasyev: This is possible. However, what can one do? For this is the explicit intention of Gorbachev's political course which he himself is setting.

DER SPIEGEL: You have repeatedly criticized the lack of access to Soviet archives. Who, in addition to the Central Committee commission, which is dealing with the rehabilitation of victims of Stalinism, has access to the archives that have been locked away for decades? Gorbachev talked of an opening some time ago.

Afanasyev: There is a group of historians who have access. I do not know the names of the individual persons. Moreover, I regard this selection process as unsatisfactory: All historians, not only an elite chosen from above, must be able to work in all archives. The old idea that there has to be one chief ideologist and, thus, also one chief historian, who alone has the big key to the past on his belt, is still at the bottom of this. If we do not overcome this and recognize that history is neither made at party congresses nor in Central Committee workrooms, we will not have a real historical science, but only historians who merely act as auxiliary organs of ideology and propaganda.

DER SPIEGEL: What new findings on the entire extent of the repression should really be expected from the opening of all archives?

Afanasyev: What is in these archives will be published or made accessible in another way some day; this has been promised by Mikhail Gorbachev. However, even afterward, there will still be many open questions. Orders for executions and the executions themselves, for example, were only documented in a few cases. Many things have to be reconstructed. Therefore, I am so decidedly in favor of oral history, the registration of memories, public archives with manuscripts, letters, and other evidence that has not been published so far.

DER SPIEGEL: "Memorial" also wants to cooperate with organizations abroad. What organizations are you thinking of?

Afanasyev: I was in the United States recently and visited the major universities. There is a great scientific potential, especially as regards Sovietologists, and sincere efforts are being made to discover the real facts without prejudice. It is high time to overcome our wrong ideas that only anti-Soviet forgers are working there.

Second, we can learn much from the experiences of the large-scale historical movement in the FRG. Third, Russian and Soviet emigration, with its numerous collections and archives in the West, is an inestimable source which we have to use. Without cooperation with foreign countries, without publishing the scientific findings that have been made there also in our country, real research work on Stalinism will be hardly possible.

Historical Role of Stalin, Stalinism Analyzed

PM1502142089 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 7, 12 Feb 89 pp 8-9

['Round table' feature by Lyudmila Saraskina involving Roy Medvedev and Dmitriy Volkogonov: "Triumph for a Tyrant, Tragedy for a People"]

[Text] A talk with Dmitriy Volkogonov and Roy Medvedev at an "MN" round table, with Lyudmila Saraskina as host.

Physically Stalin has long been dead, but politically he is still alive. Stalinism today means a suffocating economy, a mutilated world outlook, national intolerance....

L.S.: You, Roy Aleksandrovich, and you, Dmitriy Antonovich, are the authors of books on a subject which is painful, even excruciating for all of us: Stalin and Stalinism. I believe that there is hardly one historian today who would take up this theme motivated solely by professional, academic interest. Anyone who writes on this, I think, must also have profoundly personal motives—not only as a requirement of the time, but also as a requirement of the soul. Has this been the case with you?

R.M.: If we were to speak about myself, my interests as a historian and philosopher are not accidental. My destiny and that of my family took a dramatic turn under Stalin: My father, a professor and lecturer at the Lenin Military-Political Academy, was arrested in 1937 and died at Kolyma. While still at school, I began to feel that although ours was known as a socialist society, something was not right. I had always had a desire to write a book about Stalin, and I turned to this theme after the 20th Party Congress. Previously I had set my hopes on the archives which were to be declassified. But after the 22nd Congress I realized that the archives were not the main thing. The key element was the eyewitness accounts of people who had returned from imprisonment and passed through the horrible years of Stalinism. Only after the 22nd Congress did they begin to speak. Prior to that they were afraid. They were afraid even after, but this fear was no longer so strongly pronounced.

I interviewed more than 2,000 widely differing people, and in 1968 the first draft of the book was finished, based on these interviews as well as on writings which started appearing after the 20th Congress.

D.V.: Every book has its own history. I am also a philosopher and I've written some two dozen books of a politico-military character. My desire to write a book about Stalin as a political portrait arose as a result of two circumstances. First, although I did not write on philosophy, I always followed this field very closely. I was greatly impressed by Nikolay Berdyayev. When I read his books "Russia's Destiny," "The Meaning of History," and several others, I felt keenly that our domestic history, and especially that of the 1930s-1940s, was covered with a shroud, that it had to change. And second, my father was shot. He was an agronomist with little education, just a literate peasant. In 1937, he was summoned to a conference and never returned. He was followed by other close relations. We lived in the Soviet Far East, there was nowhere further to go, and my mother, a teacher, was sent with her children to the Krasnoyarsk Territory. A large prison camp was built next to the village where we lived. The eyes of a child are sensitive—much has remained in my heart from those times.

I waited a long time for serious works to appear about those times. But the short spells of thawing didn't allow the sprouts of truth to grow. Some 15 years ago I learned from a well-informed source that more than a thousand books, pamphlets and articles had been published abroad about the man who for 30 years headed our party and country. But in our country a long moratorium was imposed on this theme. I came to the conclusion that I had to try and say something on this score myself. This idea of mine originated some ten years ago. Holding an official position, I decided to consult a highly-placed person. He told me to drop it, that this would be written about only in the next century. Fortunately I didn't follow his advice, and started looking for access to various documents. I can't say that it was easy—I was never able to make my way into some archives. But in the final analysis I managed to familiarize myself with Stalin's correspondence and with the archives of Beriya, Molotov, Zhdanov and Malenkov. I met with hundreds of people: former secretaries of the Central Committee, marshals, workers in Stalin's secretariat, bodyguards, and other people whose fate had been affected by that person. I became convinced: Stalin had left the greatest dent in our history's shield. A political leader can die several times. Physically, Stalin has long been dead. But politically he is regrettably still alive. Apparently he will not die historically. He will remain a part of history, like Tamerlane, Genghis Khan and other dictators.

L.S.: You are people of the same generation, with similar interests, but from different social backgrounds and different statuses. As far as I know, Roy Aleksandrovich left his life as a public servant to do private research, whereas Dmitriy Antonovich has served in the military. I would like to compare these two situations: When working on the book, what advantages was Roy Medvedev afforded by his unofficial status, and what privations did he suffer being unprotected by a government institution? Which aspects of Volkogonov's official status facilitated his work and which hampered it?

R.M.: I must say that my unofficial status is of my own free choice. For a long time I sought to obtain full freedom for creative endeavor. Therefore as soon as I gave my book to an American publisher in 1969 and received an advance, I quit my job and worked as an independent scholar. This gives me freedom to think, act, and meet. And when Grishin told me that the party had fully resolved the question about Stalin, and that

there was no longer a need to return to it, I simply ignored that instruction. I was summoned to the district procurator's office, and even to the general procurator's office, where they demanded that I discontinue my activities. People came to me from the militia and called me a parasite. I replied that I lived and supported my family with my own money, that I was a person who wrote books, thereby earning his own livelihood as well as bringing hard currency to the country. On three occasions they came to me and left without malice, and even with a share of respect. I understand that the militiamen were acting on orders. On two occasions my flat was searched—in 1971 and in 1975—and my archives were confiscated. I anticipated this, and usually duplicated the most important documents. Besides, it was impossible to confiscate what was in my head, so these searches inflicted no great damage on me. Of course, pressure was brought to bear on me. I must say that in 1965 Yuriy Andropov, who was not yet the chairman of the KGB then, but a Central Committee secretary for the international department, not only did not denounce my work, but advised me to go on with it. At his request I presented to him the manuscript of my book "Let History Judge." I didn't meet him when he became chairman of the KGB. I was told once of his wish that I should go on working on this book, but never have it published abroad, because measures would be taken against me otherwise, and he would be unable to help me. But I didn't heed his advice and published the book abroad. I was then accused of slander and expelled from the Party. For 18 months three officers guarded my flat, checking everyone who entered and left it. This absurd action was taken after Andropov's death.

L.S.: You are often asked—sometimes reproachfully—by what miracle you managed to avoid reprisals. Recently NASH SOVREMENNIK magazine pointed out that during the stagnation years you somehow managed to publish 24 books abroad, while many other authors found themselves in a prison camp just for one book or article in SAWIZDET. What helped you evade persecution?

R.M.: I've never violated any laws. There is no law that forbids publishing books abroad. There is no law that forbids meeting American scientists and foreign journalists. In the criminal code there is an article on libel, but there is no libel in my books. Therefore I rejected all attempts to make me answerable for unlawful activities.

As far as V. Kozhinov's reproaches in NASH SOVREMENNIK are concerned, I can say just one thing: It is hard for him to even imagine the conditions under which I worked. In addition to insults addressed to me, and my expulsion from the party, there were also direct threats of arrest. When in 1970 my brother Zhores Medvedev was confined to a mental hospital for a book published in the West, Tvardovskiy, Sakharov, Kapitsa, Tendryakov and other outstanding personalities took great pains to defend him. Furthermore, Kozhinov is mistaken: I have not 24, but 29 books published abroad, and in the near future the 30th will appear in the USA. The fact that many of these works will be brought out by Soviet publishers this year merely goes to corroborate that there is nothing slanderous in them.

L.S.: Don't you find that the harsh tone of pronouncements, and readers' letters to those who avoided persecution, accusing them of complicity, is just the other side of the repressive mentality? As if to be confined in a prison camp was the normal, natural lot of every decent person, while only a downright scoundrel could avoid "ruin and jail?"

R.M.: Yes, you are right; the extremes meet here.

D.V.: For a long time I was a stricly official person and held a major post at the Army's Main Political Administration. But I felt duty bound to write a book, which I have now finished (two volumes, 70 printer's sheets), though I feared that my official status would hamper both my work and myself; so I resigned. I have now taken up strictly scientific work and am the head of the Institute of Military History, which is several grades lower than the post I held before.

I am still reproached by some who even show some measure of mistrust for my work. Look, they say, he has been given access to archives to which no one is allowed, he is nearly an "official biographer" of Stalin. I'll say right away: No one has "allowed" me anything just as no one has "forbidden" me anything. I have been and still am guided by my conscience alone. I have received about 4,000 letters with comments on my publications about Stalin: 65-70 per cent of the readers approve and 15-20 per cent disapprove. This is natural. As things stand now, our society is divided in its view of the "Great Leader". Time as well as the truth are necessary to give an appraisal which can be shared by the broad public.

L.S.: You know many people from the upper echelon of military power, including marshals and generals. What are their views on your book? How many of them are of the same mind as you? Has a distance arisen between them and you as the author of a book censuring Stalin? Do you feel like a "white crow" among them?

D.V.: Of course, not everyone initially shared my positions. Many veterans still retain old ideas, and they mustn't be denounced for this. At the beginning I really felt like a "white crow," but not now. Those whom I often get in touch with take a positive view both of me and of my undertaking. We must all understand that no matter how we may treat the past, it is our history. It is pointless to take revenge on it or turn it into a joke. There is a need to grasp it. In the final analysis, the truth is always independent.

L.S.: Books like yours are not written within a matter of weeks or months. It takes years to assimilate the material and re-experience the shock vis-a-vis the facts and events of history. Did you experience some evolution in your

own approach to the theme? What was it linked to, if at all? How did your views change in the course of the work? Did you have any preconceived ideas about Stalin?

R.M.: I must say that my ideas, which took shape in the 1960s, have in the main remained unchanged. Of course, there have been changes in detail, but not in my overall appraisal or basic principles. For instance, I didn't believe that Stalin was an agent of the tsar's secret service. I don't believe that he was a paranoiac. In 1979, the Italian Communist Party's publishing house asked me to write a biographical book about Stalin and Trotskiy. I did this by contrasting these figures. In this connection I would like to put a question to Dmitriy Antonovich. I don't understand the heading of the section of your future book about Trotskiy which appeared in PRAVDA under the title "Demon of the Revolution." As I see it, it is Stalin who was the demon of the revolution. Trotskiy fought well in the Civil War. Beginning with 1927, he abandoned political life, was later exiled to Alma-Ata, and was then deported abroad. He was not a demon or Satan who ruined our country. No one ruined our country completely, though Stalin did in a way. Trotskiy was an unattracitve figure. He worked well during the revolution, but as soon as it was over all of his thoughts were concentrated on revolution in Europe. He was an extremist, but not a demon.

D.V.: I think that the misunderstanding stems from the one-dimensional interpretation of "demon". I used the expression "demon" in the sense it was understood by Homer. These are deities who can tranform themselves into evil spirits. It was understood in the same way by Vladimir Solovyev in his famous article "On Demons" written at the beginning of the century. When Lenin was alive, Trotskiy was the country's second-in-command, one of the revolution's idols, and I wanted to show the evolution of a person who was first deified but then ostracized. The keynote of my article was that Trotskiy at that time was not an enemy of the revolution, but an enemy of Stalin. Trotskiy was a very complicated, contradictory figure, but must be given his due primarily for the fact that he was one of the few not to have been broken by Stalin.

R.M.: Of course, Stalin hated Trotskiy and wanted to destroy him. He achieved this. And, of course, within his publications Trotskiy unwittingly prodded Stalin toward repressive measures against former Trotskiyites. He knew that Stalin read his books, that one copy of everything written about Stalin was collected and translated for Stalin. Stalin even made Beriya tell anecdotes about the "Great Leader."

L.S.: It almost sounds like you're trying to excuse Stalin. Trotskiy provoked Stalin into shooting down former Trotskiyites by pouring oil on the flame with his books. As an extremely suspicious person Stalin reacted to the provocation in the proper manner.

R.M.: No, Stalin was perfectly well aware that this was just a pretext. Stalin was a very cold-blooded manipulator, and he exterminated people not because he had read Trotskiy but because he doubted their loyalty. Stalin believed in Voroshilov's sincerity, which is why the latter remained alive. Stalin believed in Budennyy, who was never distinguished by strong intellect. But he disbelieved, for instance, the loyalty of Rakovskiy, Zinovyev and Kamenev. Stalin was aware that he needed not colleagues, but faithful servants sincerely and blindly obeying his orders. He destroyed the rest because no similar docility could be expected of them. Even if he left alive some whom he distrusted, they were people who had been fooled and who served out of fear, like Vyshinskiy, for example.

D.V.: I cannot say that my attitude toward Stalin has always been the same since the 20th Congress. Only a few years ago I believed that although there was a need to lay bare the crimes, mistakes and distortions committed by Stalin, it was also necessary to see something positive in his activities. Later I realized that the crimes perpetrated by Stalin mustn't be pardoned. The most difficult methodological problem in studying Stalin is this: how to "separate" Stalin from the people. Not long before his death Trotskiy wrote: "I'm struggling in the noose of contradictions, wholly rejecting Stalin but not knowing how not to 'hurt' the people and socialism."

Stalin cast his giant, gloomy shadow on all the processes going on in our country. Therefore the main difficulty in this work for me is finding the best way to clarify events. I believe that Stalin was a criminal. His main crime was to monopolize the "right" to interpret and "defend" Lenin and thereby turn himself into a symbol of socialism. This was the greatest crime against thought. This intellectual crime was also followed by monstrous physical ones. Sometimes, returning from the archives, I cannot fall asleep. I used to come across horrible documents. For instance (I have already written about this), on the night of December 12, 1933, Stalin and Molotov signed about 30 lists with death warrants on 3,187 persons and then calmly went to see their two films. The lists contained the names of many people whom they had known very intimately. For the rest of his life Stalin endorsed the lists of people condemned by the Special Conference to hard labor. The usual term was 20 years. Beriya once reported to him that the daughter of an artist was petitioning for an "enemy of the people" Yuriy Pestel, the great-grandson of the Decembrists' leader. The man had been confined for ten years and had lost an arm. Stalin simply put the petition into the file of examined cases. That meant it was turned down.

L.S.: Can a historian, a researcher or simply the ordinary reader remain Stalinist after having studied these materials?

D.V.: I think not, if he possesses normal human feelings. I have collected data for a long time on fallen army leaders, and here I shall cite figures which have possibly

not been published anywhere. During the whole of the war we lost about 600 generals (killed, died from wounds, reported missing, etc.), but in 1937-1939 Stalin wiped out three times as many from among the top command personnel (there was no rank of general at the time). All in all, 43,000 persons from among command personnel were victimized in the Army. I have two huge volumes with the records of many of these martyrs. Possibly this sorrowful martyrology will be published sometime. They were people, usually in their forties, with awards—the flower of the Army.

L.S.: When did you first come to understand the magnitude of the crimes?

D.V.: After I had studied many of Beniya's documents. Beginning with 1937 he made annual reports to Stalin on the number of people kept in prisons, camps and corrective colonies. The capacity of the camps was always known. When a large number of POWs appeared on the Soviet Union's territory it became necessary to build many new camps. The height of the repressions was in 1937-1938 and the second peak in the late 1940s. In 1948, for instance, Stalin invited in S. Kruglov, then minister of internal affairs, and ordered him to set up several new special camps into which he should send (just think of it) Trotskiyites, Mensheviks, socialist revolutionaries, right-wingers, and so on. This was in 1948! A few months later Kruglov reported that about 18 camps had been built, to contain tens of thousands of people. But where were they to look for Trotskiyites, Mensheviks and socialist revolutionaries in 1948? They were looked for. This was the second wave, smaller than in the late 1930s, but even then some 2.5-3 million people were incarcerated in the camps. Of course, by that time the camps included quite a number of real traitors—members of the German police force and gangs.

L.S.: Do you, Dmitriy Antonovich, agree with Roy Aleksandrovich's estimates published in "MN"? To what extent do they coincide with yours?

D.V.: Mine are somewhat different. The total number of people victimized in 1937-1938 was in the vicinity of 4-4.5 million, about a million directly condemned to death. But we know that people were arrested even before 1937. The conveyor was at work. And then there were the families, the special exiles....

R.M.: Personally, I believe that it is wrong to look only at those who were imprisoned in camps or who lost their lives as the victims of repressive measures. In principle the whole people fell victim to the repressions. After all, the members of the families of those subjected to repressive measures were also victims if they loved their husbands, wives, children, and parents. Quite accidentally, I happened to talk to a retired NKVD colonel who had worked as a bookkeeper for the NKVD. He took no part either in the repressive measures or in the arrests. He estimated the value of gold mined at Kolyma and calculated the sums of money and the number of rations that went into the camp system. According to his figures, the total number of prisoners at the peak of the camp system reached some ten million.

L.S.: I would like to turn to the titles of your books. Does the expression "Let History Judge" mean, for instance, that our generation cannot get an insight into Stalinism, and that time alone will put everything in its proper place? And what meaning is there in the title "Triumph and Tragedy"—whose triumph and whose tragedy? Is it possible to speak about Stalin's tragedy?

D.V.: By my book I say: The "triumph" of one man, the leader, the dictator, is always a colossal tragedy for the people. Whatever was achieved by Stalin was not a triumph in human terms, of course, but as seen by the dictator it was a "triumph"—so that there was a "triumph" of the dictator and a colossal tragedy of the people.

R.M.: At first I used the title "In the Court of History." But I realized that this heading was inaccurate, because I could not pass the final judgement. I did not have full knowledge. And the heading "Let History Judge" is an appeal to future historians who will have more resources at their disposal.

D.V.: The final section of my book is entitled "The Verdict of History." The verdict of people is illusory or fleeting, whereas that by history is eternal. History alone can pass the final judgement. The verdict is a trial by jury, and the "jurors" are the people. The truth was the first to have fallen victim to injustice. Another victim was freedom. The main thing, for the sake of which our grandfathers and great grandfathers fought during the days of the October Revolution—freedom—was profaned by Stalin. The keynote of my book is that conscience always has a chance. Freedom has no alternative. Now I believe in this more than ever before.

L.S.: Comparing a Soviet and a Western historian, it is not difficult to notice that our man has an important advantage—he has passed through the country's tragedy and, possibly, a personal tragedy. Besides, he has access to people and their archives. And what are the advantages for a Western historian? Is the fact that Western historians are free from many of our ideological cliches and stereotypes perhaps important for creating freer, more unfettered and, most importantly, objective books?

R.M.: I even polemicized in the press on this score. Some Western historians bore a grudge against me for asserting that Soviet history can only be written by a Soviet historian who feels the spirit and understands the mentality of the country. A Westerner cannot understand our history. So I, too, wouldn't venture to write a book on the history of the United States. The main books about a country and its heroes can only be created by a person who has lived in this country.

D.V.: Berdyayev once said that everyone writes about Russia, but Russians alone have written their history with their own blood.

L.S.: Today our society has made such headway in the intellectual, historical and philosophical conceptualization of the problems of Stalinism that it is now looking for its roots in real earnest. In so doing, it touches upon such realities as the revolution and such concepts as Marxism and Leninism. But many of those who have been trying to speak about the roots of Stalinism are afraid of delving too deep, in order not to "undermine the foundations." Is Stalinism a phenomenon that is alien to the Russian revolution and to socialism, or one that is rooted in them? If it's a genetic phenomenon, is its repetition possible?

R.M.: It is there in the roots, but it is not inevitable. Three currents exist in every revolutionary movement. The extreme left, personified by Nechayev, is Stalinism. There is a right wing, which in our revolution was represented by the Mensheviks. And there is a current which is synthetic, having assimilated the passion of the left-wing current and simultaneously the reasonable moderation and sober-mindedness of the right wing. Which of them will prevail cannot be determined, and depends on events, sometimes even dramatic ones.

D.V.: I would name three basic principles on which Stalinism grew. The first—the turning of Marxism into a dogma. Stalin was a past master at this. The second—like no one else, Stalin sought to transform everything in society into part of his apparatus. This is how our society became a total bureaucracy, which Stalin needed. One of the "secrets" of Stalin's "triumph" is that he was able to gradually substitute an army of bureaucrats for the cohort of revolutionaries. Finally, the third principle—the use of violence as a universal means for resolving all problems.

It is common knowledge that every revolution carries in it a seed of Thermidor, though not necessarily like that in France. If the Leninist trend had survived, this seed would not have yielded such murderous offshoots. Stalinism was mainly to blame for the deformation of the revolution's humane ideals. Stalin was not a prophet. His understanding of the past was one-sided, for otherwise he would have grasped the secret of his rise. Any revolution gives birth to counter-revolution. Strong or weak. The October Revolution also engendered counterrevolutionary reaction. To extinguish it, there was a need for the reciprocal, second wave of the revolution. It was protracted, lasting a whole decade, and it raised many new people on its crest. Higher than all others this wave elevated Stalin. The general secretary was able to keep himself on this crest, while simultaneously pushing his potential rivals, one after another, into the abyss. When at last the revolutionary wave receded, Stalin found himself higher than all others, ashore, surrounded by a whole crowd of mandarins who had captured the key positions in society. From then on the building of socialism came to be seen not as a social, but as an administrative task.

L.S.: The attitude toward Stalin and Stalinism has now become the litmus test of one's world view. Readers' letters indicate how many people still cling to the old dogmas: there was order under Stalin; life was good and prices fell; insignificant people were not harmed, only big names were dismissed and imprisoned—probably for good reason; the Great Leader himself was a very moderate and ascetic person. Such is Stalin's "image" if we are to judge by the letters of his present-day advocates. In the book "Let History Judge" I came across this fact: the state annually spent tens of millions of roubles for the upkeep of Stalin. These facts and documents must become widely known, they must break the old false stereotypes. What do you think is the way to de-Stalinize public opinion?

R.M.: It is not for nothing that we say: "Stalin's cult." It is next to impossible to reassure a person who profoundly believes in something. Our task is to convince as many as possible, but a certain number will remain unconvinced. They continue to believe, and their spiritual life is linked to this. For them there are no authorities, because this is a cult, a religious phenomenon, fanaticism. It is pointless to try to convince fanatics.

D.V.: Let me give you an example. Higher than all else Stalin prized his life. He treasured it incredibly. When he had to fly to Potsdam, a plane was prepared for him. But after long vacillations Stalin refused to fly and decided to go by rail. The delegation was even late in arriving at the conference, because everything had been prepared and checked many times. Beriya reported that a special route was taken, and a special train was outfitted with an armored undercarriage. The route to Berlin was lined by 15 soldiers per kilometer and several armored trains accompanied him. In Potsdam seven NKVD regiments guarded him in three rings. And how many security people were there? Stalin treasured his life. But the lives of others were for him merely a sphere of classified official statistics. Indeed, he didn't like gold and valuables. He liked only power. Absolute power corrupts absolutely.

The disputes that go on are not about Stalin. People look through the prism of Stalin at the present and the future. Why has a certain reanimation of Stalinism occurred now? I think that the stagnation period and the present-day failures have been instrumental in resuscitating Stalin. We need a major positive result in the country to give us hope. Economic setbacks and inflation can torpedo restructuring. We must not allow this to happen.

De-Stalinization was started by the party at the 20th Congress, and the party must evidently completely dissociate itself from Stalin. The time has come when we need a serious, analytical party document, not necessarily a resolution, which will write "finis" to Stalinism.

***Extremists' 'Antistate, Antisocialist' Activities**
WA18000530 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 12 Feb 89 p 4

[Article by V. Sashin (Moscow): "There is a Limit to Everything..."

[Text] "In the apartment of the former political prisoner Lev Timofeyev in Yugo-Zapadnyy Rayon of Moscow there is a Toshiba-1000 computer," reports the Moscow correspondent of THE NEW YORK TIMES, Bill Keller. "Using this modern equipment Timofeyev publishes the unofficial journal REFERENDUM."

"If only I could also get my hands on a laser printer," Timofeyev dreamily remarked to the American correspondent....

NOTE. *Timofeyev, Lev Mikhaylovich, born 1936, higher education. Since 1987—without specific occupations.*

In 1976 he was working for the magazine MOLODOY KOMMUNIST and was a candidate for membership in the CPSU. "In recent years there has been a colossal rise in the standard of living of the Soviet person, the assortment of consumer goods and services has increased, and the possibilities for normal satisfaction of the material needs of our contemporaries have expanded," wrote L. Timofeyev in the April 1976 issue of the magazine.

Receiving honorariums in Soviet rubles for maxims like this, this same Timofeyev at approximately the same time but in a different hypostasis, wrote in the journal GRANI, the press mouthpiece of the foreign anti-Soviet organization "National Labor Union," where he called Soviet agriculture "a small-scale commodity, pre-capitalistic form" of production which exists under the conditions of the land relations of serfdom that are so typical of the society of 'developed socialism'." He received honorariums for such disclosures as well, but, of course, not in rubles.

NOTE. 1977-1984 L. Timofeyev, having entered into an illegal alliance with the NTS, placed at the disposal of this organization a number of manuscripts that contained conclusions and evaluations directly opposed to the points he presented on the pages of the Soviet press. In 1985 the court sentenced Timofeyev to 6 years in prison under Article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code and in February 1987 he was pardoned....

Now the hypocrite L. Timofeyev calls himself a democrat and proclaims glasnost. And again—like any turncoat—he beats himself on the chest and claims to have been a victim of injustice, a "precursor of restructuring."

During the investigation and the trial in 1985 he tried as hard as he could to conceal his connections with the NTS and preferred not to answer questions regarding this. But the hypocrite cannot hold his tongue and loves to boast. And his wife is excessively talkative as well. It is no longer a secret that Timofeyev was recommended for recruitment into the NTS during the seventies by Amalrik, who had asserted in his writings that the Soviet Union would not continue to exist up until 1984. In 1976 Amalrik left the USSR for Israel; he lived for a while in Western Europe where he engaged in active anti-Soviet activity. He died in an automobile accident near Madrid in 1980.

Today L. Timofeyev is not embarrassed or ashamed to receive emissaries of the NTS in his home. Not so long ago, for example, Kozlovskiy came from abroad to visit him and obtain "fresh information." The business negotiations took place in Timofeyev's three-room apartment. The men sat down on a roomy couch in front of a table on which a bottle of whisky already stood. The emissary's portable tape recorder registered every word.

"How are the KGB behaving themselves?" Kozlovskiy shuddered fearfully, gazing around at the walls. "I have not noticed that I have had any tails recently."

The master of the apartment, slapping the other man on the shoulder, gave his interpretation of the activity of the state security agencies, including that he and people who think like him had not yet tested the patience of the KGB.

What, specifically, did Kozlovskiy need? In the first place, tape recordings of the speeches of the leaders of certain independent social associations.

"Let me think," came the answer. "We shall try to get ahold of the cassettes you need. But if we cannot get ahold of them before you leave, we will send them to you through the embassy."

Kozlovskiy choked at these words:

"Which embassy?!"

The other man answered his question.

After that the conversation in the apartment of the "independent publisher" turned into a purely professional vein. Kozlovskiy urgently needed information about the "large seminar on the regime" where they had discussed questions of the departure abroad for permanent residence of people who had had access to information containing state and military secrets. Timofeyev, satisfied with himself, announced that he had been there: "I was the 83d to register in the debates." He did not make it clear whether he spoke or not. But he did not fail to report that he would be included in the leading nucleus of "participants in the legal protection movement."

"Are there a lot of them altogether?" the question followed.

"Well, I shall not try to count them, but from my impression I would say that there are quite a few of them and their numbers are increasing."

Timofeyev's "impressions" did not make an impression on Kozlovskiy. For the report it was necessary, of course, to have concrete figures, for otherwise you would never get anywhere.

"What do you mean by quite a few?" he probed.

Timofeyev understood what they wanted from him.

"Perhaps there were not that many active figures whose names I could give you, a couple of dozen," the master of the apartment muttered, trying not to irritate the meticulous emissary. "But activists of the second order, who...sympathize in one way or another...of course, there were thousands of them."

In his detailed report, which became the property of glasnost in the West, the NTS emissary draws the conclusion: Timofeyev and people who think as he does "have become excessively impudent."

When listing the activists by name and counting them on his fingers Timofeyev was one of the first to mention the name Grigoryants.

NOTE. Grigoryants, Sergey Ivanovich. Born 1941. Has no specific occupation. Convicted in 1975 for speculation in antiques and for slander and sentenced to 5 years in prison. In 1983 he was convicted again for an especially dangerous state crime. He was pardoned in 1987.

Strictly speaking, the phrase "without any particular occupation" applies to Timofeyev and Grigoryants only in the sense that neither of them does anything for the socialist system in our country. But with respect to harm to this system, these people are even extremely active. And in this respect their activities are quite specific.

Grigoryants, of course, is a more colorful figure. His political adventurism is combined with criminal impudence and lack of ceremony. And his passion for pressure is perhaps stronger than Timofeyev's. Once one of the Pamyat activists whom Grigoryants came to see "all in rings" with an offer of cooperation responded saying about this "defender of the law": "Grigoryants would sell his mother, buy her back, and then sell her again."

Our press has also reported on Grigoryants and his image. He is completely supported by those who dream of putting an end to socialism in our country. He specializes mainly in fanning international dissension, and has been especially zealous as a provocateur in the events in Nagorno-Karabakh and its surrounding areas. We learn much about him from his close ties with the nationalistically oriented extremist Ayrikyan who, as we know, was deprived of his Soviet citizenship and exiled from the USSR.

NOTE. P. Ayrikyan at one time provided ideological inspiration for the profascist extremist Zatikyan and two of his accomplices in the sabotage-terrorist actions committed in January 1978 which entailed the loss of human lives. That same year Zatikyan's group of criminals was unmasked by state security agencies, the terrorist-murderers were arrested, and they were given their just retribution.

The Ayrikyan-Zatikyan methods, judging from everything, were not shunned by the provocateur Grigoryants. Last year MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA reported that the rogues hired by Grigoryants, obviously from the "racketeers" had been tailing the people's patrols and members of Moscow internal affairs agencies. "Just wait, soon we shall shoot you," this came from Tsarkov, a close friend of Grigoryants who had been repeatedly arrested by the police for disturbing the peace.

But as compared to Timofeyev, Grigoryants is a political adventurist of a much higher caliber. And he probably has healthier accounts in foreign banks. He has armed guards, and private chauffeurs, and paid people to gather information. The matter has been placed on a broad footing. In November of last year, accompanied by a "bodyguard," he set out for Yerevan to collect his regular video film of those nationalistic passions that raged in the Theater Square, not without his active instigation. He was arrested and then put in jail for 30 days for violating the rules of special provisions that had been introduced in the city.

Grigoryants' boundless impudence is shown if only by this fact. Last year he published in THE NEW YORK TIMES and the French LIBERATION abusive slander to the effect that 3 million quite healthy Soviet citizens are being detained in psychiatric hospitals where "they conduct, in addition to the ordinary tests, criminal experiments" on them. By saying such a thing Grigoryants outdid all other slanderers on this subject.

And here is fresh information: On 5 and 6 January S. Grigoryants telephoned Lyudmila Flan from "Voice of America" and told her that he had "important news." He said he was conducting negotiations with "a highly placed Soviet representative." About what? About how to introduce the Western model of democracy in the Soviet Union more rapidly!

Flan gasped at such a "sensation" and hastened to announce it to the radio listeners. It cannot be ruled out that she even asked her bosses for a double honorarium for her "private correspondent," After all, someone in the West must still be willing to pay for anti-Soviet slander.

...Kozlovskiy's portable tape recorder, having dispassionately recorded Timofeyev's statements on its tape, registered one more name—Senderov.

NOTE. Senderov, Valeriy Anatolyevich. Born 1945. Higher education. Does not work anywhere. A criminal suit was brought against him in 1982. In 1983 he stated in court that he was a confirmed member of the NTS and would devote all of his subsequent life to the struggle against the system in existence in the USSR. Senderov was pardoned in 1987, but he did not draw the proper conclusions from this humanitarian act.

Moreover, Senderov, as distinct from Timofeyev and Grigoryants, does not consider it necessary to conceal his maniacal hatred for socialism and Soviet power. Nor does he conceal his passion for money, especially in foreign currency. His main occupation makes it possible to satisfy both of these passions. Senderov is a professional anti-Soviet and, in his own words, a representative of the NTS in Moscow. A representative in the sense that he is regularly supported by the NTS which is based in Frankfurt-am-Main (FRG). He maintains constant communication with NTS functionaries I. Arguzov, Yu. belov, and Yu. Bryuno.

The last "distributes the credit." He determines the amounts of "support" for their own "representative" in Moscow. Monetary transfers and packages of food are regularly sent to Senderov from abroad. In one interview Senderov declared: "Yes, I receive from the NTS money for my work for this organization. It is simply impossible to do any kind of serious work without a financial base."

The antistate and antisocialist activity of Timofeyev, Grigoryants, and Senderov is generously paid for. In the West, in the offices of the NTS, the "National Fund for the Support of Democracy," International Resistance," and other antisocialist and anti-Soviet centers are also able to count dividends from the "activity of dissidents in the USSR": the higher the level of this activity, the more abundant, of course, the allocations from the special services. A part, and a quite significant part of them are intended for conducting subversive activity directly on the territory of the USSR.

On the practical plane the heads of the NTS give instructions to Timofeyevs, Grigoryantses, and Senderovs to agitate everywhere for the creation of a bourgeois type of multiparty system and "free trade unions" and they try to inspire illegal activity on the part of certain independent social associations, to incite extremist oriented individuals to antisocial activities right down to disturbances, and to engage in the distribution of materials hostile to socialism.

Like Siamese twins, NTS members and their accomplices cannot exist without one another. Both would like to distort the democratization and restructuring to such a degree that our country is turned into an arena for persistent and bitter social and international conflicts.

At the present time this anti-Soviet "office" is exerting special efforts to spread provocatory distortions concerning the "collapse of the restructuring," the "growth of resistance" to the CPSU policy, and even an approaching... "social catastrophe." It is not accident that L. Timofeyev, S. Grigoryants, and V. Senderov, like real marionettes, give in to the reactionary forces in the West that are against the thinking in international relations and the deepening of interstate cooperation and are in favor of increasing the intervention in the internal affairs of the USSR.

Much is being reinterpreted in our country and the socialist pluralism of opinions is becoming stronger. But democracy does not mean that our society will reconcile itself to those who have entered on the path of an overt and compromising fight against socialism. Our tolerance does not mean a lack of resistance to evil or indifference to violations of the law and mockery of the ideals of restructuring.

*Academicians Defend Zaslavskaya, Aganbegyan

WA18200203 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 14 Feb 89 p 2

[Academicians' statement: "Restructuring and Morality"]

[Text] At the beginning of the radical social changes the political commentator stood in the front ranks of the struggle for new ideas. Analysis of the true state of affairs in the country's economy and public life, discussion of ways and versions for the transformations, filling in the blank spots in Soviet history, shaping the new thinking—in all these things the commentator, right from the start of restructuring, marched ahead of the social sciences, cowed by the dogmatism of the Stalin era and the falsehood and demagoguery of the period of stagnation. Glasnost and the urgency of the tasks being resolved forced them to muster their professional concern, and journalists and many writers and scholars took up their pens. We are now all doing just one very important thing.

And they started this in an empty space. The sorry state of the social sciences on the threshold of the transformations would have been many times worse if at that time, despite the ideological press from the stagnation, experience had not been gained from serious and honest scientific research, and if no work had been done on the principled civic stance that the best of the social scientists courageously defended through those long and difficult years. They also included scholars such as academicians T.I. Zaslavskaya and A.G. Aganbegyan.

It is the more mortifying and alarming that it is precisely these scholars who have been subjected to coarse and unjustified attacks from the dais of the writers' plenum and from the pages of the press. Their ideas are being set forth using unfair methods and are being directly falsified. Their scientific biographies are being mixed up, and again there are distortions and extreme tendentiousness. Doubts are being cast on the thrust of the economic reform, and here it would not be a criminal thing, for the

situation demands discussion of the alternatives; but the position of the so-called "commodities people" is being presented in a very distorted and tendentious way. The impression is being created that the purpose of these statements and published pieces is not to establish the truth, not to set one concept against another, but by any means possible to compromise leading scholars in the eyes of public opinion.

Let us turn to the facts. In the mid-sixties Academician T.I. Zaslavskaya started to study rural migration in Novosibirsk Oblast, and the internal logic of the research led to the need to conduct a theoretical examination of the country's agrarian complex as a systems object, then to embark on an analysis of the socioeconomic links in society as a whole, and then to create a model of the social mechanism involved in the development of the economy, and a new scientific discipline, namely, economic sociology.

Having started out with an alarming statement about the calamitous situation in the countryside, and about the scientific substantiation for settling demands for radical change in the bases of agrarian policy and the allocation of capital investments to develop primarily the entire rural nonproduction sphere, T.I. Zaslavskaya arrived at her concept of regarding economics as a field in which social groups and their socioeconomic interests interacted. This provided a major scientific impulse to advance from the ideology of the worker as a "labor resource" to the ideology of "the human factor" in production.

In A. Salutskiy's report to the writers' plenum this ideology was presented with an accuracy that was "back to front." Taking just one of the six functions of the agrarian sector singled out by the author, this speaker states that T.I. Zaslavskaya is the originator of precisely the "man is a labor resource" approach that she rejected. He also accuses her of unleashing and providing scientific justification for a campaign to destroy the "unpromising" villages, generalizing the speech with quotations of which the overwhelming majority belong not to Zaslavskaya but to authors whom she cites in her work. He totally ignores the fact that T.I. Zaslavskaya played an exceptionally important role in upsetting this fatal campaign: it was precisely her sharply negative expert evaluation of the "General Scheme for Resettlement on the Territory of the USSR," which originated in the USSR Gosstroy and Central Scientific Research and Planning Institute for Urban Development (they were the true authors and conductors of the "resettlement" campaign), that forced a re-examination of that part of the scheme that called for the liquidation of another 200,000 small villages in 1978.

The idea of categorizing villages as those that are promising and those that are unpromising matured in the bowels of the Central Scientific Research and Planning Institute for Urban Development and was published for the first time in 1962 in "Methodological Instructions for Drawing up Schemes for Planning in Agricultural Regions" (pages 40-41) in the institute's publications. So the planners reacted zealously to the program demands to bring the countryside closer to the city in the shortest possible time, so that during the Eighties the rural population and all the Soviet population could be living under communism. At that time T.I. Zaslavskaya was working at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics on the problems of distribution according to labor in kolkhozes, and she had nothing whatsoever to do with these recommendations.

It was precisely the policy of forcing through a voluntarist elimination of the contradictions between city and countryside that, in addition to the campaign of resettlement, gave rise to their transformation into the agro-city, the reorganization of the kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and the curtailment of private subsidiary farming. The question "Does the countryside have a future?" was left hanging in the air. It was not resolved until the seventies.

T.I. Zaslavskaya offered justified criticism to such attitudes, and it was precisely for this work that she is being analyzed so unfairly.

In this work the terms "promising" and "unpromising" (which, incidentally, A. Salutskiy should note) are not used, but there is an objective analysis of trends in rural resettlement, and steps are recommended to develop both the large settlements and the small by creating centers between settlements to provide output and services, and to expand the highway network.

The objective trend in urbanization was emphasized in the work, a trend that is expressed in particular in the growth of large rural settlements; but there is no call for a campaign of resettlement. On the contrary, when working on long-term plans for rural resettlement it is proposed to proceed from "the need for and inevitability of...preserving most of the existing and emerging new, small rural settlements and the transport communications servicing them." All of the work of T.I. Zaslavskaya considered is permeated with with a differentiated and not a campaign approach to the countryside.

A. Salutskiy's interview in the newspaper MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, and A. Staroverov's article (MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 5 February 1989) on the same subject—how T.I. Zaslavskaya worked to destroy the Russian countryside—were totally unfair in their approach. This time the basis for this was a report in which T.I. Zaslavskaya in 1975 generalized materials of a USSR Academy of Sciences commission that she headed, on socioeconomic problems in the countryside. Presenting for the government a prediction of development in the agro-industrial complex through 1990, these materials record a whole series of important and alarming trends that were clearly distinguishable in the early seventies, namely, the unjustified and harmful transformation of kolkhozes into sovkhozes, removing the population from small villages because of the poverty of

their social infrastructure, the growing proportion of alcoholic beverages in rural trade turnover, with all its depressing poverty on all parameters, the closures of schools, and the impossible condition of the roads, transport, and rural medicine. A. Salutskiy takes the mere statement of these deep and extensive processes as "recommendations" while failing to remember the well-developed and well-argued recommendations at the end of the report. And they contain the essence of the matter—an appeal for radical change in the approach to management in the countryside: every possible development of its nonproduction sphere, and in the production sphere a shift of emphasis toward cost-accounting relations at all levels and dissemination of the experience of small collectives that were paid according to final results.

We have dwelled in such detail on the work and ideas of T.I. Zaslavskaya as set forth by A. Salutskiy because she has come under the "massed fire" of unjust criticism. However, other eminent economists are also being unfairly accused. Academician A.G. Aganbegyan, for example, has been "caught out" promoting the ruinous "canal building" and being indifferent to the ecology because...at his initiative and under his leadership a scientific expedition was made to the Caspian region, an expedition that A. Salutskiy disparagingly calls "a tourist trip." Such expeditions were a normal thing for the Russian Academy of Sciences, and no one ever confused their leaders with tour guides. Then this fine tradition was forgotten, and the academician is the one to thank for its revival. A. Salutskiy reduced all the work and discussion of the expedition to a visit to the Volga-Don canal, borrowing for this the fine-sounding but tendentious description of this episode in the journal VOLGA; he had no other arguments in reserve. Meanwhile, this was one of the first meetings between the scientific community and representatives of the departments whose activity particularly threatens the ecology—a meeting in which the officials obviously lost to the scientists. A.G. Aganbegyan's report at the concluding session of the expedition in the October Hall of the House of the Unions was imbued with alarm for the ecological, economic and social state of the region. It is also worth remembering that the man being accused of indifference to the ecology is one whose signature stands beneath a letter from a number of academicians to the newspaper PRAVDA, against reversing the flow of the northern rivers—a letter that played a major role in halting the "project of the century."

As we have said, A. Salutskiy criticized the entire thrust of the economic reform now under way for the development of money-exchange relations in every possible way. The course of the reform is in many ways contradictory and is being accompanied by certain delays, and it requires constant discussion and analysis. But it is difficult to call a desire to ascribe to opponents' ideas, that they do not share and have never expressed, by the name of analysis. No serious economist proposes that every kind of centralized management or planning be eradicated, or that it be opposed by full "market spontaneity." (There has been no such thing for a long time, even in capitalist countries). Various models for reform provide for many variants in combining developed money-exchange relations with planning.

In science there is a generally accepted "presumption of honesty," or as N.I. Vavilov has said, "genes of decency." It is a certain category of moral imperative, without which science would be unable to develop. This is very important in order to prevent the emergence of a mythology about science and unbased fears of change in society, and lastly, in order to achieve unity of effort by scientists and political commentators.

[signed] Academicians O. Bogomolov, A. Nikonov, S. Shatalin. Corresponding members of the USSR Academy of Sciences P. Bunich, N. Petrakov. Doctor of Historical Sciences L. Gordon, Doctor of Economic Sciences N. Rimashevskaya. Doctor of Philosophical Sciences V. Yadov.

MVD Official Notes Number of Labor Colonies

PM1502153089 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Feb 89 p 2

[Answer to reader's question by V. Prokopenko, senior consultant at the USSR MVD press office: "How Many 'Not So Remote Places' Do We Have?"—first paragraph is reader's question]

[Text] Is the number of prisons and camps in our country falling? How many juveniles are in imprisonment? V. Gulakov, Chelyabinsk.

[Reply] V. Prokopenko, senior consultant at the USSR MVD press office, told us that our country has had no correctional labor camps for 30 years now. The number of prisons is insignificant—1 percent of all those condemned to deprivation of liberty serve their sentences in prisons.

The main form of serving sentence is correctional labor colonies. Prior to 1985 their numbers and the number of convicts detained there were rising. At present their numbers are falling. In 1988 more than 100 correctional labor colonies were closed.

The number of convicts fell by 40 percent in the last 2 years because of an amnesty and positive changes in judicial practice. That includes a 45 percent reduction in the number of juveniles.

About 30 percent of convicts are aged under 30.

On average for every 10,000 juveniles there are 107 crimes a year. At the beginning of 1989 there were 100,000 juveniles on whom a suspended sentence was passed and 30,000 juvenile offenders serving sentences in colonies, including 1,400 girls. In all there are 88 colonies for juveniles.

Leningrad TV Debate on Death Penalty Reviewed

PM1502153289 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Feb 89 p 1

[Article by Petr Kuzmenko, duty editor and member of the editorial collegium of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA: "The Highest Court"]

[Text] The program "Public Opinion" was in progress on Leningrad Television, and I, sitting at my television in Moscow, was spinning the telephone dial, tormented by my inability to get through the "busy" tone, through a hundred other opinions.... The percentages were locked in combat on the screen: "49-51," "50-50," "51-49".... I got through, shouted "yes"—the screen dispassionately noted: "50-50".... And then my "yes" was erased by someone's "no." My "yes"—for the abolition of the death penalty, for the replacement of the death penalty by life imprisonment.

The program was on Friday evening, and it was highly dramatic. The program concerned one problem—the draft law on the supreme measure of punishment. But in fact it concerned the most important issue of all—that of life and death. No, not only that of a criminal, but yours and mine too. After all, by defining for ourselves and for society the measure of the right to destroy someone's life, however unworthy, we are defining the measure of humanity in ourselves, the measure of our reason, the measure of our humanism.

Words of sympathy are an empty sound in the presence of the grief of a mother whose daughter was raped and killed by a villain, a pervert, an animal. And she, in demanding the death penalty, is right, by the right of her unbearable grief. But can we demand that the law, which has no emotion, become a machine for chopping vegetables? You cannot rise above life—life is its own limit. By putting the law above life we are depriving it of morality, we are turning it into a monster; ultimately, by appointing death the supreme arbiter, we are deifying death itself. And then there is no guarantee that no one will want to rise to the level of the deity....

These thoughts are a poor argument. We have stopped believing in words. That is why the struggle between "yes" and "no" in the studio, between two groups defending different positions, was so complex and tense. Each group included people who are not only respectable, honest, and worthy, but who clearly understand how important this problem is for the general moral condition and further development of society. Both groups included people on whom the law largely depends today: lawyers, investigators, a psychologist, a priest.... The program was presented by its originator, Tamara Maksimova. Gerts Frank, the creator of the documentary movie "The Highest Court" ["Vysshiy Sud"], a movie about a murderer condemned to death by firing squad, also took part.

I am against the death penalty. I foresee the main argument of those wno are "for" it: "But if it was your family...." Please take my word for it—I do know what it is like. But that is my own affair. My personal experience and feelings, or anyone else's, should not and cannot be the criterion for the law, the basis of reason.

Society, by applying the supreme measure of punishment, automatically cuts off, with a sigh of relief, its own unhealthy outgrowth, and it then feels healthy. But this health is imaginary, illusory—in short, thoughtless. Life imprisonment is necessary first and foremost to society—let our bad conscience stay close at hand, let our maturing intelligence forbid us to transgress....

What was also striking is that it seems that more than 80 percent of those polled are prepared to carry out the death sentence with their own hands. It seems that the majority considered it possible that the level of our humanization is lower than in highly developed countries, and so forth.

I suppose that in one way or another the majority of those who called were people whose lives have been affected by the deaths of loved ones, deaths through someone's malice.... I would like to believe that these percentages do not reflect the mood of society as a whole.

The program "Public Opinion" is not only a Leningrad event, though it is to that city's credit. It is an event in the development of the humanist thought of our entire people, and the problem it raised should be discussed by all the people. We should understand and decide what our conscience, our morality, is.

First Issue of News Digest Published in Leningrad

PM1502153789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Feb 89 Second Edition p 2

[B. Pipiya report: "The Digest'24 CHASA'"]

[Text] Leningrad—"24 CHASA" ["24 Hours"] is the name of a new newspaper, the organ of the Leningrad organization of the USSR Union of Journalists. The first issue of the 16-page publication will reach "Soyuzpechat" kiosks in the city on the Neva on 12 February.

Digest in English means a "short account." This is what it means: It is a collection, under one cover, of the most interesting articles published in various newspapers and journals. What is the essence of the name "24 CHASA"? The newspaper's task, in the opinion of its founders, is not only to encapsulate event-packed days but also to add at least 24 hours to the time people spend reading.

Here are the topics of some of the articles in the newspaper's first issue: The opinion of the U.S. journal FORTUNE on the USSR economy; the secret communication channel between J. Kennedy and N. Khrushchev; yet another version of Kirov's murder; Academician Sakharov explains his position; the fate of Stalin's children; emigration: paths and fortunes; and will the price of cars rise? The articles are reprinted from 30 Soviet central publications.

New Science, Education Weekly in Preparation

LD1502112689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0330 GMT 15 Feb 89

[From the "120 Minutes" program]

[Summary] The USSR Academy of Sciences, the State Committee for People's Education and the Central Committee of the Trade Union of People's Education and Scientific Workers are to publish a new weekly NAUKA I VYSSHAYA SHKOLA [SCIENCE AND THE HIGHER EDUCATION ESTABLISHMENT]. Yu. A. Osipyan, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, describes the new weekly, the first issue of which is being prepared for publication. It will not shy away from controversial topics such as atomic power engineering, or ecology. Those who take out a subscription will be able to familiarize themselves with the earlier unpublished articles by Vavilov, Kapitsa, Korolev and Kurchatov. The index number of the new publication is 50095. Subscriptions can be taken out at all post offices during the next several days.

'Moscow Tribune' Intellectuals' Club Founded

PM1402165289 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 7, 12 Feb 89 p 2

[Nina Belyayeva report: "Moscow Tribune"]

[Text] On February 4, at the House of Scientists, the Moscow Tribune, a new club of Moscow intellectuals, held its first meeting.

Says club member Yuriy Afanasyev: "The original idea of the Moscow Tribune was to create a centre where people could hear not just one infallible voice, but many competent and honest voices.

"While remaining an 'elitist' association, admitting new members by careful selection, the tribune invites all thinking people to take an active part in discussions, in expert and working groups analyzing particular issues."

Organizational problems are tackled by the Bureau including Ales Adamovich, Yuriy Afanasyev, Leonid Batkin, Yuriy Burtin, Mikhail Gefter, Yuriy Karyakin, Len Karpinskiy, Arkadiy Migdal, Roald Sagdeyev and Andrey Sakharov. The Bureau decides upon the topic of each meeting and prepares a press release. The Moscow Tribune will analyze problems in cooperation with the Academy's research institutes which have already set up seminars to discuss perestroyka's hottest issues.

The constituent assembly on February 4 was followed by a debate: "Public movements and government policy".

Moscow Air Traffic Controllers Air Grievances

LD1102112289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1945 GMT on 10 February broadcasts a 8-minute apparently live interview with Soviet air traffic controllers by correspondent Aleksandr Lyubin at the Moscow Air Traffic Control Center.

In his introductory remarks, Lyubimov says, "We are in Moscow's Air Traffic Control Center, where some 600 people work, ensuring order in the skies over a significant portion of the Soviet Union's European territory."

"On 1 November, the Moscow air traffic controllers announced a strike, which is still continuing. They have presented a package of demands to the Ministry of Civil Aviation. After striking for 3 months, the controllers have not abandoned their hopes for change, but they have decided that the time has come to discuss the problems of air trafficking publicly," Lyubimov continues.

Addressing a group of air traffic controllers, Lyubimov says, "I hear that American air traffic controllers are forever on strike. Have you come out in solidarity with them?"

A. Kokolevskiy, a group's spokesman, responds, "We are not on strike. This is the form of our protest against the existing social injustices...."

Lyubimov interrupts, asking, "Are you on strike or not? What do you mean?"

"We are working normally," Kokolevskiy answers. "We are completely guaranteeing the safety of flights, so airplanes are flying as before, and will continue to," he adds. "We just wanted to draw the Ministry of Civil Aviation's attention to our concerns, and we dreamt up this way: refusing our salaries."

Other air traffic controllers interject, explaining that they are worried about air traffic safety. According to B. Zashikhin, in terms of the standardized level of flight safety, the USSR "is 3.6 times behind the United States and 1.2 times behind the average flight safety level based on ICAO standards."

Another controller, Yu Baskov points out that they are worried about the policy that the more planes they control, the more they get paid. However, he remarks, this does not take stress or fatigue into account. He

estimates that the number that each man can safely control is "25 or 30 airplanes maximum, but we are being told: Direct 40 or 50, and you'll get more money. That is what upsets us."

Another controller complains that after working 15-17 years as an air traffic controller, someone can be discarded due to cardiovascular changes associated with stress or eyesight problems. Then, he observes, the only work he can find is in low-paying positions like a janitor or a docker- - at the age 35-38 it is hard to start a new career.

Why, Lyubimov asks, do they continue this work if it is so taxing and stressful. "It is man's work. It is like chess—we are always thinking," a controller responds.

The stress is a result of a lack of planning and of the inadequacies of the system that requires the interests of civil and military aviation to be combined, the controllers remark.

They note that when they were planning the protest action, they met with the heads of Moscow's Air Traffic Control Center and of the Ministry of Civil Aviation, who frankly admitted that the controllers' demands were quite justified, but that "conservatism of thought" has prevented them from resolving the issues.

"So how will this conflict end?" Lyubimov asks.

Controller S. Lutokhin responds, "We believe that we will receive an answer in the near future, and whatever it is, we will be obliged—of our own accord—to raise the level of safety in our air space. That means, we will start working strictly on the basis of the Ministry of Civil Aviation documents, setting out norms. This will protect us from the stress that we used to suffer, and it will prolong the air traffic controller's professional life."

"This will lead to substantial breaks in Aeroflot's work," controller A. Ananyev warns. "We will be obliged to impose restrictions on aircraft departing and arriving in Moscow's air zone," he concludes.

Economic

Economist Evaluates Price Control Policy

PM1402165689 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 7, 12 Feb 89 p 3

[Nikolay Shmelev article: "Yes, But..."]

[Text] With mixed feelings, I read the recent decree on rectifying the faults in the pricing policy, issued by the USSR Council of Ministers and published in the press. On the one hand, it caused irritation and bitterness, on the other, I felt gratified and relieved. I think many who are anxious about the country's economic position must have experienced similar feelings.

There is nothing unusual in such a reaction. It is unavoidably caused by the lasting contradiction between the goal, the ideal, and what we can really do at the moment to achieve it. Most certainly, injunctions, administrative pressure and bureaucratic control must at some point disappear from our economic life if we want to have a flexible, self-developing and self-adjusting economy that relies on the market. The sooner these things vanish, the better it would be for the country. But what's to be done when every bit of today's reality opposes such changes? A situation that was created and has existed over a 60-year period can't be changed overnight. But life goes on.

It would be great if the market alone could stop all attempts at price hikes and withdrawals of inexpensive goods. I hope this will happen some day. But how can this be done in conditions of the near total monopolization of our economy and shortages of all commodities where neither the manufacturer nor the consumer have any idea of competition? Sadly, the only way out today—since we still haven't converted to total cost accounting, a developed market, competition or a steady prevalence of supply over demand—is a still more rigid bureaucratic price control. The reason is that collective egotism (as we could see in the space of only one year) is as bad as individual egotism. And even if bureaucratic control is incapable of totally arresting the steady growth of inflation, it can at least slow it down.

This of course would be a gesture of desperation. But if we regard such measures as temporary and don't delude ourselves by regarding them as our salvation, these measures are useful. However we must fully realize that unless we stop the money presses and eliminate the budget deficit that reached runaway proportions last year, break down the monopolist structures in our economy and launch real competition, the inflation will be here to stay. The State Committee for Prices and other controlling agencies, given all their ambitions and imaginary "omnipotence", would be able to at least prevent very brazen attempts to "fleece" the consumer. They can't eliminate the whole problem which can only be solved by the market.

After last year's obvious setback (I have in mind limits imposed on certain activities of cooperatives) it seems we are making another step forward. Despite everything, we're going forward. Firstly, the state has plans **to step up** work to develop cooperatives. Secondly, the fundamental principle is right: "to set up organizational and economic conditions to nearly match the cooperative prices and state prices through **fair competition** (the bold type is mine—N. Sh.) between cooperatives and the state sector. Finally—in practical terms, this may be crucial—to eliminate the glaring injustice in regard to co-ops: to ensure normal supplies to them from wholesalers at prices set for their competitors—state enterprises, organizations and institutions.

If this is really arranged, then the size of the turnover tax on cooperative products and the surcharges on the products they process would be just. Finally, there would be an introduction (after a certain period of incentive taxes) of higher taxes on their incomes. Everyone should have fair chances in a competition. While co-ops today are handicapped, there is no reason why in the future they should artificially be put in a more privileged condition than state enterprises.

What is all this going to amount to? I dare not give a definite answer. If we fail to arrest the inflation generated by the huge deficit and have to finally revert to a rationing of consumer goods manufactured by state enterprise, nothing good will emerge. In such a case cooperatives would either fold up, or go to the black market anyway. No forced price control would help in this case. But if we still strike a balance in the money market in the next few years and if we in addition manage to protect the cooperative market against the sanctioned and unsanctioned mafia, this huge source of our onward movement would at last gain the scope necessary to allow a realization of its potential.

Chamber of Commerce Forms Export Association

LD1602044489 Moscow TASS in English 1622 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Text] Moscow February 15 TASS—By TASS correspondent Georgiy Meyzerov:

Some 150 Soviet industrial enterprises, scientific organizations, foreign economic associations, joint ventures and banks formed the Association of Exporters set up at the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry. It was established to protect the rights of Soviet enterprises and organisations with an access to the foreign market, to boost export of their goods, to improve export's structure and to use more vigorously such forms of cooperation as co-production and joint enterprise.

According to the association's executives, its main task is to enlist as many members as possible from among Soviet enterprises and organisations exporting goods to the world market. This will enable the association to express the collective opinion of Soviet exporters and to represent them both on the foreign market and inside the Soviet Union. The chambers of commerce and industry in union republics and regional branches of the USSR chamber establish subsidiaries of the association in localities and organise exchange of experience in export operations.

Associations of business cooperation between the USSR and foreign countries by individual regions and countries, which were set up in the past few months, have become a new component of the Soviet foreign economy structure. There are such associations with India, Italy, the FRG and Yugoslavia. The associations on cooperation with Asian and Pacific countries and Latin American states are making their first steps. The Kola Association also started its operations. It includes virtually all major enterprises in that region. The first sectoral association was established: in the sphere of the agri-industrial complex.

Associations of business cooperation between the USSR and foreign countries render assistance to Soviet enterprises, organisations and cooperatives possessing export potentialities but having no experience in foreign economic operations. They also give information on questions of marketing, pricing and control over the quality of goods. According to representatives of the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry at which associations are established, they will include in future all Soviet enterprises putting out competitive goods.

*State-Monopoly Ownership Principle Challenged

WA18200199 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 10 Feb 89 p 1

[Article by R. Khasbulatov: "What Kind of Ownership Do We Have?"

[Text] More and more frequently in the press I find a comparison between the current economic reform and the NEP period. It would seem that they are different epochs and the country's economic potential is different, but something relates them and joins them together. Reliance on cooperation? The development of the independence of the enterprises? Khozraschet? But these are not the main thing. In my opinion, the basic similarity goes much deeper. The two periods are linked by the common basis for property relations and, moreover, the change in the basic views regarding this. A recognition of this fact does not simply clarify the situation, it also warns of possible pitfalls—have there not been too many of them on our path already....

Let us look to history once again. The views on property that prevailed in theory up until 1921 are presented most fully in a book that is little known today by N. Bukharin, "Economics of a Transition Period" (1920). It was to this work that Lenin responded as follows: "...We congratulate the academy on a great work by one of its members." But what was the main thing in this work?

First of all there was the disclosure of noneconomic coercion in economics. It gives an extremely elaborate interpretation of the theory of this coercion itself: "...Coercion, however, is not limited to the framework of mainly the ruling classes and the groupings close to them. During a period of transition it is carried over—in other forms—to the workers themselves and to the ruling class itself...." Lenin wrote "true" on the margin of this page.

Noneconomic coercion, according to Bukharin, becomes possible only with a single, universal form of property—state. Throughout the entire book there is a rejection of trade and the market under socialism. According to Bukharin, the reactionaries, the kulaks, and also the middle class and even the poorest segments of the peasantry who exhibit "constant wavering" with their inherent feelings of the "owner" strive for "free trade, which is speculation, and for speculation which is free trade...the peasant is an owner and a speculator...." Here again in the margin is Lenin's "true."

Bukharin completely denies the principle of material interest during a transition period. Here is what he writes: "With a system of proletarian dictatorship the 'worker' receives a social-labor share, and not wages." Lenin has the following reaction here: "...True! And well said, without flourishes. This should be developed...." Actually, these are the main politico-economic ideas of the age of war communism.

The changeover to the NEP was an exceptionally abrupt break in both the theoretical and practical views on socialism of both Lenin and, later, Bukharin himself. To a certain degree this was also the personal tragedy of many Bolsheviks of the "first call-up" when they realized that the previous path of war communism was erroneous."...By the spring of 1921 it was clear that we had been defeated in our attempt to use the 'storm' method, i.e. the briefest, most rapid, and most direct method, to change over to socialist bases of production and distribution..."—this is what Lenin wrote about this.

During the NEP period Lenin essentially developed a qualitatively different view of socialism from the one he and his advisers arrived at by October 1917. Although he called the entire broad complex of measures the "new economic policy," the matter was not limited to economics alone. This involved a radical change in the very ideas of the organization of social, cultural-spiritual, and political life of an immense country and the complete realization of the democratic potential of this new system. Thus the main ideas of the author of "Economics of a Transition Period," which at one time were shared by Lenin himself were soon to be completely revised.

Alas, the NEP, through which the Bolsheviks of the first call-up suffered, was soon destroyed under pressure from Stalin's dictatorship. Having restored to ideology and economic practice principles that were close to the ones professed during the years of war communism, Stalin and his system left us with a difficult legacy. The rudiments of Leninist socialism were suppressed and for years a different, state-monopolistic socialism prevailed.

It is based on unified state-monopolistic ownership, which does not allow the economy to develop effectively. State-monopolistic ownership was not oriented toward human interests and needs, toward economizing on resources, reducing the capital-output ratio, or reducing prices for goods and services. Propounding the cost philosophy and ignoring the interests of the society are inherent properties of state monopolistic ownership, which can be eliminated only by eliminating the very foundations for the operation of this kind of ownership.

State monopolistic ownership led to the decline of the effectiveness of public production. This is manifested in the continuing deterioration of quality, which has become a stable tendency and has caused alarm concerning the very fate of socialism itself. Total planning within the framework of state ownership inevitably generated a deficit economy. The only motive forces were the strict orders from the center, which most frequently produced effects that were the opposite of the desired ones.

Since the ineffectiveness of our economy has long been apparent not only to the "lower levels" but also to the "higher ups," in order to "improve" the situation we have used one and the same method for many years. A new ministry, a new institution, or a new subdivision has been created, or more "management personnel" have been assigned to "guide," "indicate," and "control." As a result, the national economy up to this point has not been operating as a unified national economic complex, internally linked and "held together" by processes of division of labor. On the paths of these processes stood the ministries and departments which "broke" these ties and interconnections that had begun to develop at one time.

These ministry-department structures form a kind of "skeleton" of state monopolistic socialism. And they powerfully block all progressive changes in the economy, isolate it from the world market, retard scientific and technical progress, and suffocate enterprises and their collectives.

What we call "state" and "public" property today was actually transformed into "property" of the ministries. The concept of "state" plays only the role of a political shield for the destructive activity of the ministries.

All this, we must admit, is the direct consequence of those ideas that during the first years of October seemed so enticing. The logical development of the principle of unified state ownership led, and could not but lead to the situation which today we call the administrative-bureaucratic system.

Thus, as during Lenin's times, we really need a revolutionary break in production relations themselves. If during the twenties, years of hunger and destruction, the government was not frightened by a radical change, what are we so afraid of today?

The economic results of the first years of the restructuring convince us that we can no longer go slowly and look for compromises. The measures that have been taken are

completely inadequate—they have not led to the disappearance of state monopolistic ownership which is reinforced in the rigid principles of branch organization. And without the destruction of this system there can be no radical reform. What, specifically, do I suggest?

The first thing. The majority of ministries and departments must be eliminated and their enterprises turned over to the local soviets. They will form their own, "municipal" economy. This, as it were, might be a special, "third" form of socialist ownership—along with state and cooperative.

Second. The development of cooperative ownership "leapfrogs." With these rates cooperation will never become an economic force that can compete with the state enterprises. I think the basic principle is concealed by strong resistance of the administrative-bureaucratic system. As a result, the cooperators are objectively forced to engage in work that is far from basic from the standpoint of social interests. Consequently, the development of cooperative ownership in all spheres and branches of the economy should become one of the priority directions in the implementation of the reform and not a side effect of it.

Third. Very slowly, overcoming immense difficulties, "mixed" forms of ownership are developing (with the participation of foreign capital). There can be only bitter irony concerning the fact that the central newspapers write, almost in rapture: 120 joint enterprises have been created! On the scale of our country's economy this number could quite justifiably be equated to zero. In a year and a half—120! There has been enough time to create at least 5,000-10,000 of these enterprises. This is the minimum "unit" at which the quantitative factor grows into the qualitative factor. The basic obstacle standing in the way of the development of these enterprises is not only in the sphere of production but also in administration—terrifying bureaucratism, which is unthinkable in any civilized country, the traditional fear of what might or might not happen. And yet the effective foreign and "mixed" forms of ownership strengthen the competitive foundations of the economy that we desire so much.

Fourth. It is necessary to deprive the ministries of the very possibility of identifying their activity with the name of the state. The worst form of monopoly is a state monopoly since it acquires political nuances. Therefore there is some point in reorganizing the work of those state enterprises which after the elimination of the majority of the ministries are left in the system of "central jurisdiction." Apparently one should discuss their restructuring on ordinary company principles and on the basis of a kind of antitrust legislation. Then it will be possible to speak of state ownership in the full sense of the word, and not the "ministerial" form of it. And as state ownership it can more fully express national interests and not the interests of the "branch bureaucracy."

The socialist commercial economy is a necessary stage in the development of the productive forces of a socialist country which has entered on this path under the conditions of extremely backward forms of labor and underdeveloped production. The formation of state monopolistic structures of socialism only reinforced and stabilized the relations of the transition period. These structures must be resolutely dismantled.

*Plan Favors Industry Over Individual

WA18200192 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 8 Feb 89 p 1

[Article by E. Gorbunov, doctor of economic sciences and sector chief of the Institute of Economics of the USSR Academy of Sciences: "We Write the Plan—What Is in Our Minds?"]

[Text] "It is easier said than done"—this Russian saying comes to mind when you analyze the results of the session of the country's Supreme Soviet which ended at the end of October of last year. The word was proclaimed from the podium of the 19th party conference: It is necessary to orient the economy toward human needs. The session was to have worked out specific ways of resolving this issue. Did they manage to transform it into deeds?

It would seem that the deputies had gotten away from real life. How in a short period of time does one feed, clothe, and provide footwear in keeping with civilized norms for a country with a population of almost 300 million? How does one relieve the pressure of the housing problem as quickly as possible? Children, family recreation, illness, old age...—all these problems of ours did not melt away with discussions of increases and achievements. On the contrary, the consumer has perhaps never before held us so strictly accountable.

And there were things to complain about! Our grain losses reached 20 percent, and potato losses—40 percent. We lose one-third of all the vegetables we produce. We lose 1 million tons of meat.

A catastrophic situation has developed in the rural areas. Forty percent of the new construction projects in rural areas have no municipal services. Only three out of 100 potential customers can acquire a coat or suit at home. The rest must go to the city to do their shopping. Since 1 July 1988 a kilogram of mixed feed costs 1.5 times more than a kilogram of rye grain. Even with these insane prices there is an ineradicable, all-encompassing shortage everywhere.

The session has completed its work. How does one evaluate its results? Here are just two opinions. There has been no about-face in the direction of the needs of agriculture—this is the viewpoint of Deputy A. Zitmanis from Latvia. The draft of the plan was formulated largely in the old way, thinks Deputy V. Kuptsov from Vologda.

Nonetheless the plan for 1989 was adopted. It was adopted unanimously. This is indeed a custom handed down to us from above!

Let us look at the plan more closely. At first glance it does not arouse concern. It envisions a certain growth of the real incomes of the workers. The proportion of funds used for consumption on the whole amounts to more than four-fifths of the national income. The rates of industrial production of consumer goods outstrip the growth rates of the production of means of production by a factor of 2.3. The volumes of investments in the social sphere are increasing.

What can one say, the figures are impressive. But this still does not remove the problems. And the main one is the orientation of the economy. Alas, it still does not leave man with much hope.

It has been the custom in our country that planning has traditionally been based on the initially given indicator of the growth rate of the economy. And this immediately ascribes to the plan an arbitrary, not to say voluntaristic nature. In essence, all of its sections, including the calculations of the fund for public well-being and material, financial, and labor resources are directed toward "achieving" the "planned" production index.

A result of this arbitrary approach is the residual principle for revealing resources for the development of the sphere of consumer goods. The indicators of economic growth have traditionally been provided primarily through the development of branches that produce means of production. These branches are being developed excessively. Funds are being pumped into here not only to the detriment of the social sphere, but also at the expense of the development of the infrastructure, the ecology, and so forth.

An eminent Soviet economist, V. Kirichenko, called the calculation of the consolidated indicators in the Gosplan "literally composite, collective." It seems that time changes little in the activity of this mighty department. And up to this point the national economic plan is arithmetically compiled from the plans of individual branches. Although they are cut by the Gosplan. In other words, it initially lacks direction determined by social necessity.

If one takes the numerous economic problems that face our country, they can be broken down into three groups. They are socioeconomic problems caused by the low standard of living; production problems, generated by the high proportional expenditures in literally all branches; and, finally, problems of realizing in public production the modern achievements of scientific and technical progress, where we lag significantly behind the developed countries of the world. In these three groups we should make basic structural reforms if we want to survive.

Is this possible? Do we have sufficient resources? There is no simple answer to this. But it is impossible to conduct structural reforms within the framework of the old concepts. There should be no illusions here. It is also naive to think that the other reforms—of prices, supply, finances, and so forth—will by 1 January 1991 create principally new possibilities of economic growth. If the branch staffs continue to be the ideologists of the plan, they will continue as before to dictate their will, even with new prices and a new system of finances and wholesale trade.

The stable concept of cyclical development of consumption and accumulation took form in Stalin's times. To this day in scientific treatises and textbooks one can read: If you want to increase the rates of the economy you must sacrifice the interests of the consumer. And vice versa: Expansion of the scale of consumption, they say, essentially reduces the rates of the national income and undermines the sphere of production accumulation. Therefore we must create a powerful material base from the very beginning. And then we can "sharply raise" the standard of living of the people.

Such incantations and promises have been made from 5-year plan to 5-year plan. And as a result we have ended up on the edge of an economic abyss. We should change our minds while there is still time. But no—even today certain planners regard a change in the direction of social problems almost as a concession to the fashion for restructuring—that is, of the current moment. The right time for "resource predetermination" will return sooner or later, according to their considerations. And the "ironclad" laws of economic necessity will again begin to rule with gross output.

But are the resources of the sphere of consumption not really the resources of expanded reproduction? Can one successfully develop the economy if one is constantly limiting the level of consumption? After all, according to Marx, the essence of reproduction consists in the exchange of products between subdivisions I and II, which are equal partners in the overall production process.

The social reorientation of the economy is the new ideology of economic growth. As M.S. Gorbachev said in his speech at the 19th party conference; this is the pivotal point and cornerstone of the investment and structural policy.

The real point of any plan is for it to be balanced. Under today's conditions more than ever before it is necessary to construct it on a normative basis both in the sphere of production and in the sphere of consumption. And if we really consider the human being to be the main productive force of the society, the point of departure and the basis of the plan should be the principle of priority satisfaction of human needs.

It is known that human needs are essentially influenced, in the first place, by incomes and, in the second place, by the level of retail prices. The two of them together characterize the effective demand of the population for consumer goods and services. And the level of productivity of our labor depends directly on whether or not we are confident that we can buy what we want with what we earn. For our readiness to work is determined by how we are fed and clothed, where and how we live, and how much free time we have.

Consequently, the point of departure for calculating the national economic plan should be the primary needs of the workers. First and foremost, their current effective demand. In this case the volumes of consumer goods and services are a kind of social order from the society to the sphere of production.

Here is a clear example, as they say, of the topic of the day. The growing inflation we are encountering has become one of the major problems of the economy. Yet, as we were told at the session of the Supreme Soviet, the speed of turnover of money in branches of group B is 3-4 times higher than the average for the national economy. What does this tell us? That the saturation of the market with consumer goods and services is one of the most reliable ways of reducing inflation processes. Right down to complete elimination of them.

The entire immense and multibranch consumer complex should be the client not only for the product producing branches, but also for the sphere of production of means of production. This order is also economically determined by the specific kinds of machines, equipment, and raw material that are required for the manufacture of consumer goods and services.

The most labor-intensive section of the plan is the calculation of the production demand of subdivision I (group A for group A). But the experience of the head computer center of the USSR Gosplan makes it possible to conclude that the complexity of these calculations is not an obstacle to obtaining reliable final data. We have also proved the practical possibility of applying in planning calculations the model proposed by Doctor of Economic Sciences V. Belkin, "incomes—goods."

Thus the calculation of the plan should amount to: first, the location of the quantitative ratio between the volume of the effective demand of the population and the amount of the personal consumption funds in physical terms. Second, the search for the search for the ratio between the volume of personal consumption funds and the quantity of means of production and labor resources necessary for their manufacture. And, finally, the achievement of proportions between the volume of means of production for the output of consumer goods and those necessary for the manufacture of means of production for the production of means of production.

This approach will make it possible to achieve a quantitative connection between the differentiated balance of incomes and expenditures of the population and the branch balance of production and distribution of products. In other words, centralized planning in this form will proceed not from the needs of production but from the needs of man. For man. In the name of man.

Icebreaker Aids Transport, Saves 'Millions'

OW1502141889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 13 Feb 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; L.Savitskiy video report]

[Text] The icebreaker *Magadan* returned to Vladivostok after delivering foodstuffs to the oil workers on Sakhalin.

[Savitskiy] Right now, the usual mission of *Magadan* is to escort tankers to the wharves of Vladivostok's oil-handling terminal and form paths in the Amur Bay ice for passenger ferries. At the beginning of winter, however, this icebreaker, for the first time in the history of seafaring, has, so late in the season, made a path for a transport vessel to the Moskalvo port on Sakhalin. Had the operation failed, the cargo would have had to be airlifted to the north of the island. This would have cost millions. A shallow draft coupled with a powerful 13,000 horsepower engine allows this icebreaker—the only one of its type—to perform unique tasks, including joint operations with nuclear-powered vessels in the Arctic.

However, intensive year-round use of the vessel has its price. Right here at the waterline and beneath, the special coating has worn off. [video focuses on the vessel, showing corrosion of ship's hulk] The seams on the hulk are corroding.

[Begin video recording of *Magadan* Captain Ye. I. Osmak, speaking to Savitskiy on ship's bridge] Since it was launched, our icebreaker has been working for over 5 years. During this time 80 to 90 percent of the special paint used to cover the hulk has been rubbed off by arctic and Sea of Okhotsk ice. Its ability to operate under icy conditions has decreased. The icebreaker is liable to become ice-bound. All the unique qualities of the icebreaker are being negated. Those who are responsible for the operation and maintenance of our ships seem to be unattentive to our problems because we are beginning to notice excessive use of fuel and a decrease in the vessel's speed. In the future, a situation may arise when, under the difficult conditions in which our icebreakers operate, this icebreaker itself will require an escort. [end recording]

[Savitskiy] In the near future it will be necessary, under factory conditions, to restore the hulk skin which allows the vessel to slide through ice. This will not only prolong the working life of the icebreaker but allow it to render more significant aid to the transport vessels during the forthcoming period of Arctic navigation.

Agricultural

Further on Ligachev, Nikonov Remarks in Kharkov

LD1402184389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1140 GMT 14 Feb 89

[Aleksandr Ruvinskiy report: "The Town's Food Problem"]

[Excerpts] [Ruvinskiy] This program is devoted to some results of the conference held last week in Kharkov. The mass media has reported it widely. I will just remind you that its task was to acquaint secretaries of party gorkoms and chairmen of gorispolkoms of large cities and industrial centers with the experience of participation of town industrial enterprises in resolving the food problem. Such experience exists, and a considerable part of the seminar was devoted directly to the familiarization of its participants with the enterprises of Kharkov and Belgorod Oblasts. These tours were preceded by a plenary session, and here is what Comrade Nikonov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said when delivering a report at the session.

[Begin Nikonov recording] You know that the forthcoming plenum of the party Central Committee is to examine the issues of the CPSU's agrarian policy at the stage of restructuring. The goals and the ways and means to attain them are being worked through very thoroughly at the moment. Taking part in this are large groups of scientists; heads of farms; leading designers; workers from kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and cooperatives; and leaseholders. This meeting with you is also part of the preparations for the forthcoming plenum. The experience of individual regions and vegetable produce, potatoes, milk, dairy products, meat, and other kinds of food to the population depends to a large extent on how vigorously town party organizations and soviets of people's deputies cooperate with enterprises of the agro-industrial complex, and how they make use of their immense opportunities to enhance agricultural output and the development of the infrastructure, first and foremost in the suburban zone. [end recording]

[Ruvinskiy] Indeed, one could find out for oneself that a vast amount of work is being done in Kharkov and Belgorod Oblasts to give various types of assistance to the rural areas. I can quote some comparisons. For example, in Belgorod, work worth R50 for every R1,000 of industrial output is carried out for the agro-industrial complex, while in Ryazan Oblast, it is only 76 kopeks, and R2.30 in Kiev, and in such a major industrial city as Chelyabinsk, it is a little over R4.50. [passage omitted]

Of course, the participants in the conference, including the leaders of our party—and taking part in it were Comrades Ligachev, Nikonov, Shcherbitskiy and Vlasov—had numerous meetings in the streets both of Kharkov and of Belgorod. The participants headed for Belgorod:

[Begin recording] [Ligachev] So what they are telling us about and showing us? It is all in the shops, is it? And is there meat in the state (?shops)?

[Unidentified woman] Not often, but it is always in the cooperative zones.

[Ligachev] You know why (?it is like that here)? It is because not only the kolkhozes and sovkhozes, not only agriculture, are working well. You have sugar rationing. Why is it that in the United States they consume 32 or 34 kilograms, and the world average is 30-35 kg? We have already got up to 46 kg, and we still do not have enough. Well, comrade ladies, doesn't (?this) worry you?

[Woman] We have enough in summer, we have made our jam, we did it all.

[Ligachev] No, no, look, the question is connected with drunkenness. Does that worry you or not?

[Women] Of course.

[Ligachev] It does worry you, doesn't it? Don't we have a revival of it again, isn't the old story going to begin again?

[Women] No, no, no.

[Ligachev] No?

[Women] No! [passage indistinct]

[Ligachev] Thank you for your work, comrades. You are helping us very much indeed, because the town is doing a lot to help the countryside. I will tell you, this experience is invaluable, so hearty thanks to you for this.

[Woman] Thank you. [end recording] [passage omitted]

[Ruvinskiy] I was very impressed, and I think the participants in the conference were, too, by the visits to two industrial enterprises, and our acquaintance there with the experience of organizing public catering. One of them is the major proton association. Here, all conditions have been created for the enterprise's canteen and numerous cafeterias not only to provide good, cheap food, but also to provide facilities to relax. The works has also taken on responsibility for seeing that the families of its workers also have to worry less about food. The medical plastics and stomatological materials works is a relatively small enterprise, but it, too, has its interesting experience. With a minumum of expense, it has fitted out its own vegetable storage depot. In essence, it is a big cellar. In it are various pickles made to household recipes and village sunflower oil, and all this is put on the table gratis. Having concluded mutually beneficial contracts with farms having ponds, the works supplies its staff with live fish, and gets honey from the hives. All this

is also on a mutually beneficial basis. The factory workers help the kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and the latter sell them their produce. Delivering the closing speech at the conference, Comrade Ligachev drew attention to such mutual interest.

[Begin Ligachev recording] We very much support the desire of individual plants to take lossmaking farms under their wing. We have met with such examples here in Kharkov and Belgorod Oblasts. We have also met with another very interesting phenomenon, which has been spoken of from this rostrum: Some of our industrial enterprises have gone into joint production with kolkhozes and sovkhozes to produce meat, milk, fruit, and vegetables. These ties, as we understand it, are very varied, and this is very good. The common factor in them is that they take account of the material interests of both sides, of the industrial enterprise and of the kolkhozes and sovkhozes. The town invests funds in the development of kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and receives a certain proportion of the above-plan production according to a contract. We consider that the development of such equitable economic relations, taking into account the interests of the labor collectives in industry and in agriculture, should be developed in every way. I think that this will also gain approval at the forthcoming party Central Committee plenum.

It is very important—extremely important, I would say—to form within labor collectives an atmosphere of goodwill and of vigorous search for ways to resolve the problems of rural areas. We know that some 60 towns already have their own programs, their own plans for work by the town in the countryside. We are asking all the leaders of the towns and kray, oblast, and republican centers represented here today to have a plan of action in this area in the very near future. [end recording] [passage omitted]

Agricultural Developments for 9-15 Feb
LD1602000689

[Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, unless otherwise indicated, on 9-15 February. GMT times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

9-12 February

No fileworthy items monitored.

13 February

Almost 30 million hectares of arable land will be sown with spring crops in Kazakhstan this year. (0901)

14 February

Ukraine: The results of 4 months of livestock wintering have been summed up. It is proceeding with difficulty because of a shortage of fodder. The production and purchase of milk have gone down 3 percent from the same period last winter. Meat production and procurement have increased by 55,000 tonnes, and 33 million more eggs have been produced. (1200)

The sugar season is over in Altay and 66,000 tonnes of granulated sugar have been produced. This is the highest result since 1955. (1200)

15 February

No fileworthy items monitored.

Scientific

'Molniya' Satellite Launched 15 Feb
LD1602081989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0740 GMT 16 Feb 89

[Text] Moscow, 16 Feb (TASS)—The latest earth satellite "Molniya-1" was launched on Wednesday [15 February] by the "Molniya" rocket launcher. The satellite is intended to provide for the use of the long-distance telephone and telegraph radio communication system, as well as for broadcasting USSR Central Television program to points on the "orbita" network.

The satellite has been placed in a high ellipsis orbit with the following parameters: apogee 38.937 km in the northern hemisphere and perigee 486 km in the southern hemisphere. Rotation time is 11 hours 38 minutes and orbital inclination 62.5 degrees.

Communication sessions through the "Molniya-1" satellite will take place in accordance with the scheduled program.

Military

Promotions to General, Marshal Announced
LD1502131289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 15 Feb 89

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has conferred military titles: Army General on Colonel Generals Vladimir Nikolayevich Lobov, Mikhail Alekseyevich Moyseyev, and Vladimir Mikhaylovich Shuralev; Marshal of Artillery on Colonel General Vladimir Mikhaylovich Mikhalkin; and the title of Marshal of Aviation on Colonel General Aleksa[illegible]ikitovich Volkov.

Election Meeting Focuses on Army Restructuring

PM1502161089 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Feb 89 Second Edition p 1

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Colonel B. Karpov report: "Restructuring—Time for Action"]

[Text] Many primary party organizations in the Far Eastern and Transbaykal Military Districts and the Pacific Fleet had earlier put forward proposals to nominate Army General A. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, as a candidate USSR people's deputy from the Communist Party. It is well known that the CPSU Central Committee January (1989) plenum named him as a candidate USSR people's deputy. In the course of election meetings held in Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy, Chita, and Ulan-Ude, the Far East and Transbaykal servicemen, Pacific seamen, and border guards met with Army General A. Lizichev.

A committed, principled discussion, so unlike the election meetings of past years, was held in Khabarovsk at the district officers institute. Lieutenant General V. Lukinykh, the candidate's agent, described Aleksey Dmitriyevich's life and noted his contribution to restructuring in the Army and Navy.

The meeting was addressed by Major General A. Zolotov, chief of the political department of the staff and directorates of the district; Captain N. Nikolabay, deputy commander of an aviation squadron; Junior Sergeant S. Boytsov, secretary of a tank battalion Komsomol committee; and retired Major S. Travkin, chairman of the Khabarovsk war and labor veterans section. The speakers spoke of their support for the CPSU's platform and the course of renewal of society. The idea that permeated the voters' mandates was that of the need for reliable defense of the motherland's Far East borders in the conditions of the reduction of the Armed Forces, the reforming [pereformirovaniye] of formations and units on the basis of a defensive structure, and the further development of democratization and glasnost.

In his speech Army General A. Lizichev devoted great attention to problems of restructuring in the Army and Navy and questions of increasing combat readiness, stepping up ideological work, and strengthening military discipline. He assured voters that all their instructions will be carefully studied. The candidate deputy answered questions put to the presidium in notes and by way of a microphone installed in the auditorium.

'Special Assignment' Troops Honored Posthumously

PM1502154789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Feb 89 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "In the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Text] By a decree of 13 February 1989 the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has conferred USSR orders and medals on Soviet Army servicemen for courage and valor shown in the fulfillment of a special assignment of the command.

The Order of the Red Banner has been conferred on Lieutenant B.M. Gusev (posthumously) and the Order of the Red Star has been conferred on Private A.I. Kosenko (posthumously), Private First Class E.S. Pushkel, and Private O.A. Yurchenko (posthumously).

The Order "For Service to the Motherland in the USSR Armed Forces" Third Class has been conferred on 2 people, the medal "For Valor" on 51 people, and the medal "For Combat Services" on 10 people.

The decree is published in VEDOMOSTI VERKHOVNOGO SOVETA SSSR.

Soldier's Valor Described

PM1502105589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Feb 89 First Edition p 1

[Report by I. Yefimenkov and Ye. Stremovskiy under the rubric "News: Facts, Events, Commentaries": "On That Day in Kirovabad"]

[Text] Yesterday KRASNAYA ZVEZDA reported that by a 13 February 1989 decree the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has awarded orders and medals of the USSR to Soviet Army servicemen for the courage and valor they displayed in fulfilling a special command mission.

Today our story is about one of them—Lieutenant Boris Gusev, posthumously awarded the Order of the Red Banner.

...The date was 22 November 1988. Kirovabad, the square next to the hotel. A line of soldiers and commanders was restraining with difficulty the onslaught of people enraged to the point of fanaticism. Someone from the crowd threw a bottle containing gasoline at an airborne combat vehicle. The vehicle caught fire like a torch. The driver's life was in danger.

"Fifth company, forward!" the company's commander, Senior Lieutenant Stepanenko, issued the order.

The airborne troops rushed three abreast, in combat formation. They were met with a hail of stones. But they pushed back the crowd, pulling their helmets down over their foreheads and covering their faces with their sapper's shovels. Behind them were the Armenian districts. There were women, children, and old men there....

And suddenly a ZIL-130 dump truck with no one driving it struck the rear of the company. Plowing through the formation, the truck ran into a tree and eight boys from the platoon remained lying on the ground. They included platoon commander Lt B. Gusev.

...The doctors at the local hospital took cover behind closed doors. The doors had to be broken down, the airborne troops had no other way of saving their comrades' lives. But precious time was lost.

Lt B. Gusev died before the morning. He departed this life before reaching the age of 22. Kind and cheerful, Boris had always been everyone's favorite—at school, at the Ryazan Higher Airborne Command School, and in his own company. He died defending the lives of totally innocent people, fulfilling his duty to the end.